

Carruthers, J. B. A Predication of Technical School Success.

1948

**FOR REFERENCE**

**Do Not Take From This Room**

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Ed.

LIBRARY

Thesis  
Carruthers, J.B.  
1948

The Gift of J.B. Carruthers

**FOR REFERENCE**

**Do Not Take From This Room**

Ed.  
Thesis  
Carruthers, J. B.  
1948

Stored

EdM

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

1948

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

carru

cap1

Thesis

## A PREDICTION OF TECHNICAL SCHOOL SUCCESS

Submitted by John Burr Carruthers II  
(A.B. Clark University 1938)

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for  
the degree of Master of Education

1948

✓

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

COLLECTION OF BOOKS

Gift of J. B. Carruthers  
School of Education

class of  
September 20, 1948  
3002A

RECORDED AND INDEXED IN LIBRARY

IT IS DESIRED THAT THIS BOOK BE RETURNED  
(THIS IS A LOAN LIBRARY BOOK)

TO THE LIBRARIAN OR TO THE CIRCULATION LIBRARIAN  
OR LIBRARIAN TO REQUEST ITS RETURN

class of

Thesis Approved:

First Reader: J. Wendell Yeo

Second Reader: William C. Kvaraceus

Third Reader: John V. Gilmore

APPENDIX

A  
1. TELEGRAPHY  
2. AIRPORTS  
3. AIRPORT CATALOG  
4. AIRPORT MAPS  
5. AIRPORT INFORMATION  
6. AIRPORTS OFFERED AT NEW TROPICAL  
INSTITUTE  
7. DETAILS OF THE MARKING SYSTEM AT  
NEW TROPICAL INSTITUTE

Aboriginal class

First reader

Second reader

Third reader

L. Newell Key

William C. Revels

John A. Gilmore

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I	DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM
II	PREVIOUS RELATED RESEARCH
III	THE PROCEDURE
IV	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OBTAINED
V	CONCLUSIONS
VI	SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH
APPENDIX	AL. COURSES, TECHNICAL COURSES, NO. 508, ABC COURSES, AND TECHNICAL MATHEMATICS
A	BIBLIOGRAPHY TECHNICAL DRAWING, APPLIED PHYSICS, AND MOTOR POWER PERIODICALS TEST MANUALS
B	TESTS ADMINISTERED
C	COURSES OFFERED AT WXYZ TECHNICAL INSTITUTE DRAWING, AND APPLIED PHYSICS
D	DETAILS OF THE MARKING SYSTEM AT THE WXYZ TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	SECTION	PAGE
I	DEFINITION OF THE PROGRAM	1
II	PREVIOUS RELATED RESEARCH	11
III	THE PROCEDURE	111
VI	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OBTAINED	111
V	CONCLUSION	111
IV		111
A	REFLECTIONS	111
B	BOOKS	111
C	PERIODICALS	111
D	TEST MANUFACTURERS	111
E	TEST ADMINISTRATORS	111
F	CONFERENCES ORGANIZED AT MAXS TECHNICAL	111
G	INSTITUTES	111
H	DETAILS OF THE WORKING STAFF AT MAXS TECHNICAL INSTITUTE	111

INDEX OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I	OTIS Q-S MENTAL ABILITY TEST
II	REVISED MINNESOTA PAPER FORM BOARD
III	BENNETT MECHANICAL COMPREHENSION
IV	FOUST-SCHORLING MATHEMATICS AND THE IOWA ALGEBRA TEST
V	PURDUE INDUSTRIAL TEST, THE THURSTONE ARITHMETIC, AND THE OTIS ARITHMETIC
VI	ALL COURSES, TECHNICAL COURSES, MC, SDE,&EC COURSES, AND TECHNICAL MATHEMATICS
VII	TECHNICAL MECHANICAL DRAWING, APPLIED PHYSICS, ELECTRICITY, AND MOTOR LABORATORY
VIII	TECHNICAL MACHINE WORK, PATTERNMAKING, WELDING, AND ENGLISH
IX	ALL TRADE COURSES, TRADE MATHEMATICS, MECHANICAL DRAWING, AND APPLIED PHYSICS
X	INTERCORRELATIONS OF THE TESTS IN THE BATTERY

INDEX OF TABLES

TABLE	TITLE
	OTIS-6-8 MENTAL ABILITY TEST
II	SEVERED MINNESOTA PAPER FOLD TEST
III	SEVERED MECHANICAL COMPREHENSION
VI	BOUT-SCHORLING MATHEMATICS AND THE LOWA ALGEBRA TEST
V	PURDUE INDUSTRIAL TEST, THE TURNSTONES ARITHMETIC, AND THE OTIS ARITHMETIC
IV	ALL COURSES, TECHNICAL COURSES, NO SOC. SEC. COURSES, AND TECHNICAL MATHEMATICS
VII	TECHNICAL MECHANICAL DRAWING, APPLIED PHYSICS, ELECTRICITY, AND MOTOR PROBLEMS
VIII	TECHNICAL DRAWING WORK, PATTERNMAKING, WELDING, AND SMELTER
IX	ALL TRADE COURSES, TRADE MATHEMATICS, MECHANICAL DRAWING, AND APPLIED PHYSICS
X	INTERCORRELATION OF THE TESTS IN THE SATTY

## CHAPTER I

The problem of selection of students with the best possible chance for success was one that arose when the author was personnel director at WXYZ Technical Institute. The principal of the school and the head of the admissions committee realized the need of research in this area. With their cooperation a tentative battery of paper and pencil tests was selected and administered to prospective students. The battery had to be chosen on an empirical basis as the available studies did not relate directly to technical institutes. This was somewhat surprising considering the fact that prediction of school success is one of the more common areas of educational research. The fact that technical institutes are a more recent arrival on the educational scene may be partly responsible. The other is that a majority of the schools are proprietary and thus have a different outlook from an endowed institution. As available studies were on such related fields as shop courses in high schools, engineering colleges, industry and defense and armed force training programs the tests had to be chosen as being most closely related to our problem. Even if studies had been found that were based on ~~Machine work and tool making, and Building Com-~~



technical institutes the problem would still have existed of validating them against the specific situation.

Separate test batteries were set up for the technical and the trade courses. Both included the Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test, the Revised Minnesota Paper Form Board, and the Bennett Test of Mechanical Comprehension. The technical battery included the Foust-Schorling Test of Functional Thinking in Mathematics and the Iowa Algebra Aptitude Test. The trade group received the Purdue Industrial Classification Test, the Otis Arithmetic Test and the Thurstone Vocational Guidance Test in Arithmetic. From here on in this thesis these tests will be referred to by the abbreviated titles commonly used in the field of guidance. For the full title, form, author and publisher the reader is directed to Appendix B.

The school offers technical courses in Machine Construction and Tool Design, Steam and Diesel Engineering, Architectural Construction, Aircraft Maintenance Engineering, Electrical Construction, and Industrial Electronics. The trade level courses offered include Pattern-making and Machine Design, Machine Work and Tool Making, and Building Con-



struction. Henceforth these courses will be referred to by the first letters of the course title. The three trade courses include eight different subjects and the six technical courses include nineteen different subjects. Appendix C gives the breakdown of the subjects listed in the various courses. Only first year subjects are listed as the study is based on the first year marks. The major difference between the two courses is the absence of higher mathematics and the greater emphasis on shop work in the trade courses.

The problem then is whether it is possible to select successful students on the basis of a battery of paper and pencil tests. It may be further broken down into success in the school, success in one of the two types of courses, success in the separate courses, or success in the individual subject. At first glance it might seem that there is a certain amount of overlapping here. To some extent this may be true. The author felt that in a pilot study the greatest value could be achieved by investigating each of these areas to see which offered the best potentialities for further research. For example, if the skills needed (or the level of skill) varied from course to course or



from subject to subject then achievement in the larger groupings might mask the true picture. It would seem to be worth investigation for at the very least it would serve to show areas not productive for further study.

One hundred and seventy nine of the applicants tested were accepted as students and remained in school long enough so that marks were available as a criterion of school success. The author realizes that there has been a great deal of criticism of the conventional marking systems. Much of it is undoubtedly valid but even if a working substitute were available the problem here is not one of reform of the marking system but of prediction of success within that framework. As objective achievement tests do not exist in the subjects covered in a technical institute in most instances the only available criteria are the subject marks. Seeing that the factor of school success and therefore marks are largely distorted by the personal factor the probability exists that success in a job is also influenced by this same factor. If this premise were true then ability to get along in school would imply a somewhat similar ability at work. Whether this holds generally true or not the



problem is to find a better method of predicting success in this school within the present marking system. The elimination of those that fail would enable the students to save their time and the school to devote its energies to those with the best potentiality for success. This is certainly a worthwhile objective from both points of view.

Appendix D lists the details of the marking system used by the school. The method of weighting the subjects in relation to their importance for success in the course has certain commendable points. The weights given to the various subjects are listed in Appendix C. The danger of subjective empiricism is present due to the fact that faculty action was the basis for arriving at the weights to be given to a subject. The hours spent on a subject as well as its relative importance were taken into consideration. It might be that the differential between course and subject achievement might balance out due to the factor of weighting.

The problem is limited to one entering class. The study should be worth the time involved however as it should give some indication of the direction most promising for further research. No expectation is entertained that such a brief study could more than start on



the road to a solution to the problem as to whether it is possible to predict success in a technical institute on the basis of a battery of group tests.

The problem of school success has been a rather common one in the field of educational psychology. The available studies were in shop courses, trade high schools, college engineering, defense training courses, armed forces training courses, and industrial studies. Empirically we would expect a certain amount of similarity as on the surface the criterion appears to be similar in many instances.

This writer intends to show the previous correlations of both reliability and validity for the tests in the battery. This is not perhaps the most common method of handling the question of previous research. It seems to have certain advantages in this case as for one thing no previous study duplicated the present test battery. In a way it leaves little alternative except to report previous studies on the basis of what was uncovered in the literature on the individual tests.

The Otis Q-S, the Otis Arithmetic and the Thurstone Arithmetic were largely included in the battery because they had been previously used in the school and the admissions committee was familiar with them.

ti rendedw of se maldng sifr of malmes a of haor and  
estriden fassions a ni asecone deifer of eldiasoq el  
aized quoy le vistad a le aized and no

No previous studies for CHAPTER II to try to validate  
these tests for PREVIOUS RELATED RESEARCH are chosen on

The problem of school success has been a rather common one in the field of educational psychology. The available studies were in shop courses, trade high schools, college engineering, defense training courses, armed forces training courses, and industrial studies. Empirically we would expect a certain amount of similarity as on the surface the criterion appears to be similar in many instances.

This writer intends to show the previous correlations of both reliability and validity for the tests in the battery. This is not perhaps the most common method of handling the question of previous research. It seems to have certain advantages in this case as for one thing no previous study duplicated the present test battery. In a way it leaves little alternative except to report previous studies on the basis of what was uncovered in the literature on the individual tests.

The Otis Q-S, the Otis Arithmetic and the Thurstone Arithmetic were largely included in the battery because they had been previously used in the school and the admissions committee was familiar with them.



No previous studies had been made to try to validate these tests however. The other tests were chosen on the basis of what previous studies had shown and by inspection of the tests to see if they seemed to have elements that might be considered necessary to success in school. The tests will be taken up in the order in which they are listed in Appendix B.

The Otis Q-S has a reliability reported as ranging from .85 to .91 with the use of the Spearman-Brown formula.<sup>1</sup> The correlation with the Otis S-A higher form was .86.<sup>2</sup> The best validity correlations obtained were .69 with grades in a fabric inspection course and .60 in a material testing course in a defense training program.<sup>3</sup> While the other extreme showed a correlation as low as -.37 with a supervisor's rating on quantity of production and -.23 with the actual production.<sup>4</sup>

1. A.I.S., Otis. "Manual of Directions for Gamma Tests, Forms Am and Bm of Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests," World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1937

2. Ibid.

3. W. McGehee and D. J. Moffie. "Psychological Tests in the Selection of Enrollees in Engineering, Science, Management, Defense Training Courses," Journal of Applied Psychology, 26, 584-86

4. J. Tiffin and R. J. Greenly. "Employee Selection Tests for Electrical Fixture Assemblers and Radio Assemblers," Journal of Applied Psychology, 23, 240-63



The Minnesota Paper Form Board has an interform reliability of .85 and of .92 using the Spearman-Brown formula. Other reliability studies showed .85, .92, .93 and .90. In the area of validity, correlations from .43 to .18 with engineering students were found; with judged trade ability of apprentices .58; with defense courses on instructors ratings in aeronautical repair .03, aircraft engines .18 and aircraft electricity .22; with mechanical drawing grades .49 and with descriptive geometry grades .32; with the Otis

1. W. H. Quasha and R. Likert. "The Revised Minnesota Paper Form Board Test," Journal of Educational Psychology, (1937), 28, 197-204

2. W. H. Quasha and R. Likert. "Manual of Directions for the Revised Minnesota Paper Form Board Test," Psychological Corporation, New York, 1941

3. E. N. Brush, "Mechanical Ability as a Factor in Engineering Aptitude," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1941), 25, 300-12

4. O. M. Hall. "An Aid to the Selection of Pressman Apprentices," Personnel Journal, (1933), 9, 77-81

5. Brush, op. cit.

6. Hall, op. cit.

7. Jacobsen. "Evaluation of Certain Tests in Predicting Mechanical Learner Achievement," Educational and Psychological Measurements, (1943), 3, 3-21

8. W. H. Quasha and R. Likert. "The Revised Minnesota Paper Form Board Test," Journal of Educational Psychology, (1937), 28, 197-204



1                   2

Mental Ability .53 and .40; with percent efficiency of put-in-coil girl -.52, with average number of assemblies per hour of pull-socket assemblers .05, with percent efficiency of power sewing-machine operators .31 and .48, and with percent efficiency of merchandise packers .49; with proficiency of inspector-packers .57; and .14 with grades in architectural engineering and .35 with engineering drawing in defense courses.

The Bennett Mechanical test shows reliabilities of .84 by the Spearman-Brown formula and from .90 to .93 by the test-retest. The validities found were .65 with grades in aircraft inspection, .35 with architectural

1. G. K. Bennett and R. M. Cruikshank. A Summary of Manual and Mechanical Ability Tests (Preliminary Form), Psychological Corporation, New York, 1942.

2. Quasha and Likert, op. cit.

3. W. H. Stead, C. L. Shartle, et al. Occupational Counseling Techniques, American Book Company, New York, 1940

4. E. E. Ghiselli. "Tests for the Selection of Inspector-Packers," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1942), 26, 468-76

5. McGehee and Moffie, op. cit.

6. G. K. Bennett. "Manual of Directions, Test of Mechanical Comprehension Form AA, " Psychological Corporation, New York, 1941

7. Bennett and Cruikshank, op. cit.



engineering and .16 with material testing; .24 with  
instructors rating in mechanical ability; with Co-  
operative Physics test .53 and with the Cooperative  
Algebra .17; with the Otis S-A Mental Ability .45;  
with the Moore Arithmetic Reasoning test .52 and with  
chemistry course grades .36; with supervisors' rating  
in operation of machine tools .64; with instructors'  
ratings in aircraft engines .11, aircraft electricity  
.41, and machine shop .35; and with the Revised Minne-  
sota Paper Form Board .59.

1. McGehee and Moffie, op. cit.
2. J. W. McDaniel and W. A. Reynolds. "Study and Use of Mechanical Aptitude Tests in the Selection of Trainees for Mechanical Occupations," *Educational and Psychological Measurements*, (1944), 4, 191-197
3. Bennett and Cruikshank, op. cit.
4. B. V. Moore. "Analysis of Results of Tests Administered to Men in Engineering Defense Training Courses," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, (1941), 25, 619-35
5. Bennett and Cruikshank, op. cit.
6. G. K. Bennett and R. A. Fear. "Mechanical Comprehension and Dexterity," *Personnel Journal*, (1943), 22, 12-17
7. Jacobsen, op. cit.
8. Bennett, op. cit.



The Foust-Schorling Mathematics test showed <sup>1</sup> interform reliabilities ranging from .67 to .88 and from .82 to .88 using the Kuder-Richardson formula. <sup>1</sup> Correlations of .66 with the Terman-McNemar Test of Mental Ability and .53 with the Schorling-Clark-Potter 100 Arithmetic Problem Test were reported in the <sup>2</sup> literature. <sup>2</sup> ~~Mathematics or the Thorndike Arithmetic. This~~

The reliability reported on the Iowa Algebra test <sup>3</sup> was .87 using the Kuder-Richardson formula. Validities were reported that showed .66 with algebra grades, .76 with the California Research Algebra tests and .80 and <sup>4</sup> .81 with two other algebra prognosis tests. <sup>4</sup> ~~liminary classification~~

1. J. W. Foust and R. Schorling. "Manual of Directions for the Foust-Schorling Test of Functional Thinking in Mathematics," World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1944

2. Ibid.

3. H. A. Greene and A. H. Piper. "Examiner's Manual for the Revised Edition of the Iowa Algebra Aptitude Test," Bureau of Educational Research and Service, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1942

4. Ibid.

. 181 .

The Purdue Industrial test showed reliabilities ranging from .73 to .94. Critical ratios of 3.0 between the upper and lower twenty-five percents of the National Youth Administration industrial trainees and 4.6 for National Defense trainees were reported.<sup>1</sup><sup>2</sup>

No statistical results were discovered for either the Otis Arithmetic or the Thurstone Arithmetic. This writer is loath to report verbalizations.

The reader may find a comparison between these results and those obtained in the present study interesting.

1. C. H. Lawshe and A. C. Moutoux. "Preliminary Manual for the Purdue Industrial Training Classification Test," Science Research Associates, Chicago, 1942

2. Ibid. since series the net effect is of only seven categories (see Appendix D). The computation of the grade index (Appendix D) gives the surface appearance of a continuous series but as it is based on the letter grades this is an assumption rather than an actual occurrence. If the grade index were used for the courses then the subjects would have to be based on the letter grades only which would not give an accurate comparison between subject and course achievement which is one of the areas felt to need investigation in this



### CHAPTER III

#### THE PROCEDURE

Previous research in related areas would lead one to expect some relationship between test scores and school marks. The question was not whether a relationship existed but rather how strong it was. The bi-serial  $r$  for correlation between the test scores and the school marks was used because it was felt to be more important to predict the group into which the student fell than his exact individual position on a scale. The other factor that led to the adoption of the bi-serial  $r$  was that the school marks available were in letter grades only. While in theory the marks were a continuous series the net effect is of only seven categories (see Appendix D). The computation of the grade index (Appendix D) gives the surface appearance of a continuous series but as it is based on the letter grades this is an assumption rather than an actual occurrence. If the grade index were used for the courses then the subjects would have to be based on the letter grades only which would not give an accurate comparison between subject and course achievement which is one of the areas felt to need investigation in this



pilot study. When the above was added to the probability that it would be more valuable to the school in the selection of students to predict the more successful as opposed to the less successful, the bi-serial  $r$  was the final choice.

The formula used for the computation of the bi-serial  $r$  was 
$$\frac{M_p - M_q}{\sigma} \cdot \frac{pq}{z}$$
 in which  $M_p$  equals the mean of the upper group,  $M_q$  equals the mean of the lower group,  $\sigma$  equals the standard deviation of the entire group,  $p$  equals the proportion of the whole group in category one,  $q$  equals the proportion of the whole group in category two ( $p = 1-q$ ), and  $z$  equals the height of the ordinate in the normal curve dividing  $p$  from  $q$ .

The next decision was where the division should be made to give the dichotomous classifications necessary for computation of the bi-serial  $r$ . The splits were made in all cases between the actual school grades. The reason why the lowest ten or twenty percent was not used as the criterion refers back to the fact that the letter grades are not usable as a continuous series

L. H. E. Garrett. Statistics in Psychology and Education, Third Edition, Longmans, Green and Company, New York, 1947, p. xii-350



for if a percentage comes in the middle of a grade no way exists of telling which individuals are actually higher or lower.

The question still remained as to where on the scale the divisions should be made. A few experimental correlations were run splitting the marks at all the grade divisions. On the basis of these trial runs the optimum cutting points were chosen for the experiment as a whole. Two division points seemed to offer about equal results and it was decided to use both throughout the study. These were a split between the marks of A, B $\frac{1}{2}$ , B, and C $\frac{1}{2}$ , and of C, P, and D; and between the marks of A, B $\frac{1}{2}$ , and B, and of C $\frac{1}{2}$ , C, P, and D. The possibility exists that some worthwhile relationships may have been missed by not running correlations at every possible dividing point. As sixteen correlations were run using a variety of division points and as the two listed above were the only ones showing enough promise there seems to be reasonable basis for limiting this study to these two different dichotomies.

The obtained bi-serial r's were tested against the null hypothesis by the formula  $t = \frac{r_{bi} \sqrt{N-2}}{\sqrt{1-r^2}}$ .<sup>1</sup>

1. Ibid., p. 298

on eðing a to elbbim edit ni eamco egaþnefðr a li for  
viflumur eis aðaþivibat heldw galilei to aðaþe yew  
·xwoi to wedild  
edit no eðowd of ne berlamer illis nolæsdr enT  
-læsdr we l A . eðowd ed blifra amaisivib edit aðaþe  
ta aðaþem edit galilfis pur eðew amaisletrr Isfum  
Isfum eðaðt to aðaðt edit no amaisivib eðing edit lls  
edit to l nesodr eðew aðaðt galilfis munitgo edit eðowd  
of bæmre eðing noisivib owt . eðowd a ea lñemitdæks  
eis of hebbis eaw vi lns aðlumur larsp aðowd nello  
neowd dñis a eðow eðaðt . yðrða edit tñowdumit dñs  
bns ;D bns ,9 ,0 to bns ,40 bns ,5 ,41 ,A to aðaþem edit  
bns ,1 ,0 ,40 to bns ,3 bns ,48 ,A to aðaþem edit neowd  
-aðer aðlumitow eðow dñis aðaþe yðlilfisq edit . D  
-aðer galilfisr con yðr bæmre need eðan yðr aðlumit  
neekla aA . eðing galilfis aðlumit yðrva ja aðlumit  
noisivib to galilfis a galilfis pur eðew amaisletrr  
eðow yðr eðow eðow bæfll owt edit að bns eðing  
aðlumit eð of amas eðaðt eðimorq dñmose galilfis  
aðlumit owt eðaðt of yðr eðaðt galilfis to l aðaðt  
·aðlumit  
edit færlinge færlinge eðow a' r Isfum-ld berlumdr edit  
f . S-111-12 . 3 aðlumit eis yðr aðlumitdæks lns  
889 . q . 191 . f .

In actual use Garrett's table #49 is entered with N-2 degrees of freedom and entry shown is the size correlation that must be found before we can say that the obtained correlation is not due to errors of sampling. To put it another way, if the obtained correlation is larger than the table entry then we may be confident at the .01 or .05 level that the true correlation is not zero. The use of the null hypothesis as a test for the significance of correlation is most useful when the number is small as it is there that the  $PE_r$  bis is apt to be most misleading. The reason Garrett gives for this is that the formula of  $PE_r$  bis is based on the use of the population  $r_{bis}$  and one actually used in the computation is the sample  $r_{bis}$  so that at best all we get is an approximation of the error of the obtained correlation. The other factor is that the sampling distribution of  $r_{bis}$  is not normal except when the population  $r_{bis}$  is .00 and N is large.<sup>1</sup> As only a few of the correlations in this study had N's larger than 100 and as many had less than 50, the use of the null hypothesis seemed to offer a more valid criterion for judging the significance of the obtained correlations.

1. Ibid., p. 297-302 standard scores or percentiles.

2-11 nixiñ beretne si 000 eidsat a'ccetrañ ean fandos al  
-misterio eais edd al inwos yñne has mobesur lo seoyeb  
-eis jadz qea nro ev ecolas banol ed jadz jadz molis  
-gafignas lo-erotte of ean den al molisalertos beniaddo  
-si molisalertos beniaddo eis li yew redions si duq o  
-de inabillos ed qam ev nro yñne eidsat ent nro rega  
-tions al molisalertos ent eis jadz level 60. to 10. ent  
-eis jadz e se alaedtoqvi llin edd lo ean ent . oren  
-eis nro lulean dwom si molisalertos lo consolingis  
-jgs si eis qd eis jadz eredz si si es lliem si tewm  
-nol sevq idetrañ nroeset ent . gafibaelaim dwom ed o  
-ean edd no berasd al eis qd lo almento edd jadz al sind  
-eis pi benn yññios uno bnn eis molisalertos eis lo  
-ew lli jadz ja jadz os eis tñqas eis si molisalertos  
-beniaddo eis lo nrore eis lo molisalertos ne si reg  
-gafignas eis jadz al nroeset nroeset ent . molisalertos  
-eis nro yññio lliem ton si eis lo molisalertos  
-nol e qmz si . yññiñ si K bnn 00. si eis molisalertos  
-nro regal a'ñ bnd yñnd a'ñ si molisalertos eis lo  
-llin edd lo ean eis . 00 eadz seel bnd yñnd ne bnn 001  
-to molisalertos bñlaz etom a'ñ tñlo oñ bñmee alaendogvi  
-molisalertos beniaddo eis lo consolingis eis gañhut

In the tables in Chapter IV the significance of the bi-serial correlations are shown as measured against both the .01 and the .05 level. This writer feels that the .01 level is the better criterion but as this is more or less of a pilot study it was thought that the indication of those reaching the .05 level might be of assistance in indicating potentialities for further research.

The study is based on the first year marks of the one hundred and seventy-nine students. The marks of those who dropped out of school for any reason including failure were included using the marks obtained as though they had completed the year. This was done so that their influence on the total result would not be lost.

The arbitrary number of twenty-nine was chosen as the smallest group on which to run a correlation. It was cut here because of the class sizes. Also, it was felt that any groups smaller than this had little to offer. The  $\sigma$  on the groups of less than 100 was actually  $s$  as  $N-1$  was used in its computation. In all cases the raw test scores were used rather than intelligence quotients, standard scores or percentiles.



The intercorrelations between the various tests in the battery shown in Table X were computed by the Pearson product moment formula. As the test scores were both actually continuous series this seemed the most suitable and certainly the one most commonly used in research in this area. Here again the obtained  $r$  was tested against the null hypothesis. In some instances where the optimal finding would be a low correlation the fact that the null hypothesis was retained is the ideal finding. On the assumption that the true or population  $r$  was zero then if the obtained correlation can be attributed to sampling errors then we could assume pending further study that the probability existed that we were actually testing separate factors. A glance at Table I compared to Table VI should make clear the difference in formulation involved.

Table I (page 1) shows the bi-serial correlations between the Otis Q-S Mental Ability Test and the various criteria. Of forty-four correlations (twenty-two criterion run in each of the dichotomies used) ten were significant at the .01 level and seven at the .05 level. The correlations significant at the .01 level show four in the .20 to .30 bracket, four in the .30



## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA OBTAINED

In the attempts to analyze the data garnered by the methods indicated in the preceding chapter the question became one of whether it would be more advantageous to arrange the tables to show all the correlations with the various criteria obtained for each test in the battery, or whether the tables should show the correlations obtained for each criterion with the various tests. As each offered advantages not possible for the other the final decision was to give the complete data for the first and for the second to show those that were correlated with enough different tests so that some comparisons would be inherent in the tables. A glance at Table I compared to Table VI should make clear the difference in tabulation involved.

Table I (page ) shows the bi-serial correlations between the Otis Q-S Mental Ability Test and the various criteria. Of forty-four correlations (twenty-two criterion run in each of the dichotomies used) ten are significant at the .01 level and seven at the .05 level. The correlations significant at the .01 level show four in the .20 to .30 bracket, four in the .30



to .40, and two in the TABLE I 50 while at the .05 level one OTIS QUICK-SCORING MENTAL ABILITY TEST to .30.

Criteria	Number	A, B $\neq$ , B, C $\neq$ vs. C, P, D	A, B $\neq$ , B vs. C $\neq$ , C, P, D
Total grades (all courses)	179	.23 **	.15 #
Technical courses	133	.37 **	.25 **
Technical Math.	133	.25 **	.28 **
M.C., S.&D.E., & E.C. Courses	61	.48 **	.17
A.C. course	31	.28	.06
Technical English	91	.38 **	.46 **
Tech. Patternmaking	74	.06	.03
Tech. Welding	77	.06	.09
Tech. Electricity	86	.24 #	.16
Tech. Elec. Motor Lab.	86	.16	.24 #
Tech. Machine Work	74	.03	-.06
Tech. Arch. Drawing	31	.26	.23
Tech. Bldg. Methods	31	.16	.02
Tech. Carpentry	31	.15	.06
Tech. Applied Physics (AC)	31	.17	.03
Tech. Bldg. Mat. Lab.	31	.07	.15
Tech. Mech. Drawing	102	.36 **	.10
Tech. Applied Physics	86	.19	.32
Trade courses	46	.35 #	.35 #
Trade Physics	46	.33 #	.26
Trade Mech. Draw.	30	-.04	.19
Trade Math.	46	-.09	.33 #

\*\* Significant at .01 level tested against the null hypothesis

# Significant at .05 level tested against the null hypothesis



to .40, and two in the .40 to .50 while at the .05 level one is in the .10 to .20, two in the .20 to .30, and four in the .30 to .40 grouping. The evaluation rather common in the interpretation of the significance of  $r$ 's is to call .00 to .20 indifferent, .20 to .40 as present but low, .40 to .70 as marked or substantial, and .70 to 1.00 as very significant.

1, 2, 3, 4

Only two correlations at the .01 level reach the arbitrary level of "marked" (.40 to .70) and none of those at the .05 level. These are one of .48\*\* with MC, SDE, and EC course grades and .46\*\* with technical English grades. The general trend throughout this table is for a slightly higher correlation to be shown for those subjects that by inspection seem to have more academic elements. Correlations of .03 and -.06 with technical machine work, .06 and .03 with technical patternmaking, and .06 and .09 with technical welding

---

1. W. V. Bingham. Aptitudes and Aptitude Testing, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1937

2. M. E. Broom. Educational Statistics, American Book Company, New York, 1936

3. Garrett, op. cit.

4. H. O. Rugg. Statistical Methods Applied to Education, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1917



as opposed to older and TABLE II technical mechanical  
drawing, .1 REVISED MINNESOTA PAPER FORM BOARD physics

Criteria	Number	A, B, C, F vs. C, P, D	A, B, C, F vs. C, P, D
Total grades (all courses)	179	.27 **	.22 **
Technical courses	133	.28 **	.19 #
M.C., S.&D.E., & E.C. Courses	61	.39 **	.05
A.C. course	31	.38 #	.01
Tech. English	90	-.13	.04
Tech. Patternmaking	74	.48 **	.28 #
Tech. Welding	77	.19	.20
Tech. Mach. Work	74	.04	.21
Tech. Electricity	86	.38 **	.31 **
Tech. Elec. Motor	86	.15	.21 #
Tech. Arch. Drawing	31	.00	.05
Tech. Bldg. Methods	31	-.21	.25
Tech. Carpentry	31	.52 **	.48 **
Tech. Applied AC	31	.23	-.06
Physics			
Tech. Bldg. Mat.	31	.01	-.12
Tech. Mech. Drawing	102	.27 **	.31 **
Tech. Applied Physics	86	-.03	.21 #
Tech. Mathematics	133	-.02	.01
Trade courses	46	.39 **	.35 #
Trade Physics	46	.37 #	.15
Trade Mech. Draw.	30	-.10	-.02
Trade Math.	46	.30 #	.50 **

\*\* Significant at .01 level

# Significant at .05 level



as opposed to .36\*\* and .10 with technical mechanical drawing, .19 and .32\*\* with technical applied physics and .25\*\* and .28\*\* with technical mathematics are examples of the trend just mentioned. All the correlations reaching a level of significance are in the more academic subjects with the single exception of technical electrical motor laboratory which shows .16 and .24#.

The bi-serial correlations between the Minnesota Paper Form Board and the school criteria are in Table II (page 11). Here also forty-four correlations were run. In this instance there were thirteen correlations significant at the .01 level and eight at the .05 level. At the .01 level four were in the .20 to .30 group, five in the .30 to .40, three in the .40 to .50, and one in the .50 to .60. While of those reaching the .05 level one was in the .10 to .20 group, four in the .20 to .30 and three in the .30 to .40 classification. Using the arbitrary level of .40 or above we find technical patternmaking with .48\*\* and .28#, technical carpentry with .52\*\* and .48\*\*, and trade mathematics with .30# and .50\*\*. Technical mathematics shows correlations of only -.02 and .01 which compared to the trade mathematics above does not seem quite logical.



A possible clue could be that the trade mathematics is based to a larger extent than is the technical on practical problems. This is not conclusive but is at least suggestive. On the other hand, if we compare those on technical patternmaking mentioned above with those of .04 and .21 in technical machine work no logical answer is immediately apparent for the use of wood in one and metal in the other hardly seems the answer and the machines involved are basically similar except for the material they work on. The course description offers nothing that on the surface is a reasonable clue. Technical carpentry consists of a different group of students and involves less complicated woodworking and yet the correlations are .52\*\* and .48\*\*. Technical mechanical drawing, which empirically one would expect to be high, shows only .27\*\* and .31\*\*, trade mechanical drawing shows much less -.10 and -.02, and technical architectural drawing is .00 and .05. No answer is apparent from the available evidence. More experimentation is obviously needed before an answer can be given. It might be that this test is not an all-round measure of spatial relations but present evidence is not sufficient to prove or disprove this.

Significant at .01 level



The correlations of TABLE III the Bennett Mechanical  
Comprehension BENNETT MECHANICAL COMPREHENSION TEST

Criteria	Number	A, B, C, F vs. C, P, D	A, B, C, F vs. C, P, D
Total grades (all courses)	138	.02	.16
Tech. Courses	99	.15	.38 **
M.C., S.&D.E., & E.C. Courses	47	.24	.50 **
Tech. English	68	-.13	-.10
Tech. Patternmaking	58	.38 **	.64 **
Tech. Welding	60	.10	.28 #
Tech. Elec. Motor Lab.	64	.18	.27 #
Tech. Electricity	64	.25 #	.46 **
Tech. Mach. Work	58	.10	.00
Tech. Mech. Drawing	77	.32 **	.23 #
Tech. Applied Physics	64	.18	.28 #
Tech. Mathematics	99	.21 #	.19
Trade courses	38	-.04	.02
Trade Physics	38	-.22	-.27
Trade Mathematics	38	-.45 **	-.22

\*\* Significant at .01 level

# Significant at .05 level



The correlations involving the Bennett Mechanical Comprehension are to be found in Table III on page . Here thirty correlations were run on the fifteen groups that were larger than the chosen minimum. Seven were significant at the one percent level and six at the five percent level. At the .01 level three were in the .30 to .40, two in the .40 to .50, one in the .60 to .70 and one in the -.40 to -.50 range. All six of those at the .05 level were in the .20 to .30 grouping. Here as in the Paper Form Board we find no pattern such as the Otis showed in the ability to discriminate between the academic and the shop subjects. Evidently this pilot study has only been an entering wedge into a wide problem. Further proof of the above statement could be implicit in the difference between technical applied physics of .18 and .28# and trade applied physics of -.22 and .27. The possibility exists that the differences might be dependent on the differences between the present students more than on any other factor. Only further experimentation could answer this.

The results of the Foust-Schorling show twenty-two correlations with the eleven criterian that were above the size selected as a minimum (Table IV, page ).



or these ten were significant at the one percent level  
 TABLE IV  
 and the FOUST-SCHORLING TEST OF FUNCTIONAL THINKING  
 Level show three in IN MATHEMATICS

Criteria	Number	A,B $\neq$ ,B,C $\neq$ vs. C,P,D,	A,B $\neq$ ,B vs. C $\neq$ ,C,P,D
Tech. Courses	107	.46 **	.41 **
MC,S&DE,&EC Courses	50	.61 **	.38 **
Tech. English	71	.11	.08
Tech. Patternmaking	59	-.12	-.14
Tech. Welding	63	.07	.25 #
Tech. Mach. Work	61	.00	-.19
Tech. Elec. Motor	72	.08	.23
Lab.			
Tech. Electricity	72	.30 #	.50 **
Tech. Mech. Drawing	85	.44 **	.32 **
Tech. Appld. Physics	72	.39 **	.42 **
Tech. Math.	107	.22 #	.43 **

IOWA ALGEBRA PROGNOSIS TEST

Criteria	Number	A,B $\neq$ ,B,C $\neq$ vs. C,P,D,	A,B $\neq$ ,B vs. C $\neq$ ,C,P,D
Tech. Courses	95	.42 **	.32 **
MC,S&DE,&EC Courses	46	.53 **	.40 **
Tech. English	64	.17	-.01
Tech. Patternmaking	56	-.17	-.04
Tech. Welding	59	-.10	.11
Tech. Mach. Work	57	-.11	-.16
Tech. Elec. Motor	63	.18	.15
Lab.			
Tech. Electricity	63	.29 #	.54 **
Tech. Mech. Draw.	76	.36 **	.23 #
Tech. Appld. Physics	63	.45 **	.46 **
Tech. Math.	95	.36 **	.44 **

~ \*\* Significant at .01 level    # Significant at .05  
 level

TABLE VI  
ROUT-SCHORLING TEST OF FUNCTIONAL INTINNITI  
IN MATHEMATICS

8,43,A as 0,9,0,40	40,8,45,A as 0,9,0	Number	Classification
** 14.	** 24.	704	Top. Committee
** 25.	** 21.	80	MC, SAD, SMC Committee
26.	11.	74	Top. Majority
14.	15.	28	Top. Secretaries
** 22.	20.	82	Top. Middle
11.	00.	61	Top. Minor. Minor
33.	08.	45	Top. Head. Doctor
** 30.	** 30.	75	Top. Mississippian
** 35.	** 24.	82	Top. Major. Drawing
** 34.	** 28.	33	Top. Major. Major
** 24.	** 32.	103	Top. Major

IOWA ALGEBRA PROGRESSIVE TEST

8,43,A as 0,9,0,40	40,8,45,A as 0,9,0	Number	Classification
** 25.	** 24.	30	Top. Committee
** 04.	** 22.	24	MC, SAD, SMC Committee
10.	11.	44	Top. Majority
20.	13.	28	Top. Secretaries
11.	10.	22	Top. Middle
16.	11.	23	Top. Minor. Minor
13.	18.	20	Top. Head. Doctor
** 22.	** 22.	22	Top. Mississippian
** 23.	** 25.	28	Top. Major. Drawing
** 24.	** 24.	22	Top. Major. Major
** 24.	** 22.	22	Top. Major

20. In signifying a level to be attained at the  
level

Of these ten were significant at the one percent level and three at the five percent level. Those at the .01 level show three in the .30 to .40 range, six in the .40 to .50, and one in the .60 to .70 while all three at the .05 level are in the .20 to .30 grouping. Here again the pattern seems to be that the significant and the higher correlations are in the subjects requiring academic ability with the exception of technical English of .11 and .08. The term academic as used here has mainly the implication that it is the opposite of shop work, manual ability, and so forth, and is not intended to carry any implication of liberal arts or related. Those having the higher correlations are technical electricity .30# and .50\*\*, technical mechanical drawing .44\*\* and .32\*\*, technical applied physics .39\*\* and .42\*\*, technical mathematics .22# and .43\*\*, total technical courses .46\*\* and .41\*\*, and MC, SDE, and EC courses .61\*\* and .38\*\*.

The Iowa Algebra results are also in Table IV on page . For the eleven criteria twenty-two correlations were run of which ten were significant at the one percent level and two at the five percent level. On the .01 level three were in the .30 to .40, five in the .40 to .50, and two in the .50 to .60 grouping while both



of those at the .05 level were in the .20 to .30 range. Here as in the Foust-Schorling, and in a lesser extent as far as the size of the obtained bi-serial r's is concerned, the Otis Q-S, the pattern seems to show more correlation with the subjects that empirically at least require more academic or book ability. The examples are technical electricity .29# and .54\*\*, technical mechanical drawing .36\*\* and .23#, technical applied physics .45\*\* and .46\*\*, and technical mathematics .36\*\* and .44\*\*. The total technical courses show .42\*\* and .32\*\* and the MC, SDE, and ED courses .53\*\* and .40\*\* which possibly indicates that the weighting involved in the total grade index (see Appendix C and D) gives more weight to academic subjects than to shop. although this is not inherent in the present data.

The Purdue Industrial Test, the Thurstone Arithmetic test, and the Otis Arithmetic test are all in Table V on page . These tests were administered to those in the trade courses and very few of the groups were large enough to meet the arbitrary minimum for size of groups on which correlations were run.

The Purdue Industrial test shows six correlations, two significant at the one percent level and two at the five percent level. These are all trade courses .35#



TABLE V

## PURDUE INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION TEST

Criteria	Number	A, B $\neq$ , B, C $\neq$ vs. C, P, D	A, B $\neq$ , B vs. C $\neq$ , C, P, D
Trade Courses	36	.35 #	.57 **
Trade Physics	36	.35 #	.46 **
Trade Mathematics	36	.29	-.01

## THURSTONE VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE TEST IN ARITHMETIC

Criteria	Number	A, B $\neq$ , B, C $\neq$ vs. C, P, D	A, B $\neq$ , B vs. C $\neq$ , C, P, D
Trade Courses	36	.51 **	.65 **
Trade Physics	36	.48 **	.52 **
Trade Mathematics	36	.20	.00

## OTIS ARITHMETIC TEST

Criteria	Number	A, B $\neq$ , B, C $\neq$ vs. C, P, D	A, B $\neq$ , B vs. C $\neq$ , C, P, D
Total Courses	66	.19	.15
Tech. Courses	37	.23	.18
Tech. Mathematics	37	.39 #	.31
Trade Courses	29	.35	.32
Trade Physics	29	.20	.18
Trade Mathematics	29	.34	.36

\*\* Significant at .01 level. This is in the .30 to .40 grouping.

# Significant at .05 level. This is in the .30 to .40 grouping.

If the numbers involved had been somewhat larger the possibility exists that significant

TABLE A  
PDRDUE INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION TEST

8,48,A as 0,9,0,40	40,8,48,A as 0,9,0	Number	Classification
** 24.	** 22.	26	Trade Contractors
** 24.	** 22.	26	Trade Importers
OT.	25.	26	Trade Manufacturers

THURSTON ADDITIONAL SUBDIVISION TEST

8,48,A as 0,9,0,40	40,8,48,A as 0,9,0	Number	Classification
** 26.	** 25.	26	Trade Contractors
** 25.	** 26.	26	Trade Importers
00.	25.	26	Trade Manufacturers

OTI ADDITIONAL TEST

8,48,A as 0,9,0,40	40,8,48,A as 0,9,0	Number	Classification
21.	21.	26	Total Contractors
21.	22.	26	Total Contractors
21.	22.	26	Total Manufacturers
22.	22.	26	Trade Contractors
21.	25.	26	Trade Importers
22.	25.	26	Trade Manufacturers

level 10. as starting at

level 20. as incilingie

and .57\*\* and trade physics .35# and .46\*\*. Trade mathematics is .29 and -.01 which is not what one might have expected. Why the correlation with the physics is higher than with the mathematics is something that will need more study before even the start of an answer will appear.

The Thurstone Arithmetic test also has six correlations run, four of which are significant at the one percent level and none at the five percent. Of these one is in the .40 to .50 range, two in the .50 to .60, and one in the .60 to .70. Here as in the Purdue Industrial test we find high correlation with two of the criteria, all trade courses .51\*\* and .65\*\* and trade physics .48\*\* and .52\*\* while the third which on the surface would seem more closely related to the test (trade mathematics) shows only .20 and .00. The available data does not give any obvious clue to the answer although the size of the groups makes further research almost essential before any conclusions are attempted.

The Otis Arithmetic test on which twelve correlations were run shows only one that is significant and that only at the five percent level. This is in the .30 to .40 grouping. If the numbers involved had been somewhat larger the possibility exists that significant



correlations might have been shown as trade mathematics with an N of 29 was .34 and .36. The only one reaching the present test of significance was in technical mathematics with .39# and .31.

In looking back over the ability to predict from a test the achievement in the school, in the course or in the various subjects, there is a great range for any given test as in the areas showing some, little, or no correlation. Tables VI through IX on pages , ,

, and show the correlations listed by each criterion for the various tests. If in Table VI we look at the tests that predict in all courses, technical courses, and MC, SDE, and EC courses we find a general pattern that the correlation increases as we go from the more general all courses to the more specific (in terms of subjects included in the curriculum) of MC, SDE, and EC courses. The examples of this would be the Otis Q-S of .23\*\* and .15# in all courses, .37\*\* and .25\*\* in technical courses, and .48\*\* and .17 in MC, SDE, and EC courses; the Minnesota Paper Form Board of .27\*\* and .22\*\* in all courses, .28\*\* and .19# in technical courses, and .39\*\* and .05 in MC, SDE, and EC courses; and the Bennett Mechanical of .02 and .16 in all courses, .15 and .38\*\* in technical courses,



TABLE VI

Test	Number	A through C/ vs. C through D		A through B vs. C/ through D	
		ALL COURSES	TECHNICAL COURSES	MC, S&DE, & EC COURSES	TECHNICAL MATHEMATICS
Otis Q-S	179	.23 **	.37 **	.15 #	.25 **
Minn. P.F.B.	179	.27 **	.28 **	.22 **	.19 #
Bennett Mech.	138	.02	.15	.16	.38 **
Otis Arith.	66	.19	.46 **	.15	.41 **
Iowa Algebra	95	.42 **	.53 **	.32 **	.44 **
Otis Q-S	133	.37 **	.24	.25 **	.18
Minn. P.F.B.	133	.28 **	.39 **	.19 #	.05
Bennett Mech.	99	.15	.61 **	.50 **	.38 **
Foust-Schorling	107	.46 **	.53 **	.41 **	.43 **
Iowa Algebra	95	.42 **	.53 **	.32 **	.44 **
Otis Arith.	37	.23	.39 #	.18	.31

\*\* Significant at .01 level

# Significant at .05 level

TABLE IV

Number of transitions to	Number of transitions from	Number of transitions from	Level
ALL COUNTS			
18	22	176	0.01a 6-8
22	24	176	0.01a 6-8
18	20	178	0.01a-0.02 Bennet-Schoelline
18	18	88	0.01a 6-8
TECHNICAL COUNTS			
22 22	24 24	172	0.01a 6-8
18	28	172	0.01a 6-8
22	28	98	0.01a-0.02 Bennet-Schoelline
18	28	702	0.01a-0.02 Lowe Viegas
22 22	28 28	88	0.01a 6-8
18	22	32	0.01a 6-8
0.01, 0.02, & 0.03 COUNTS			
18	24	61	0.01a 6-8
20	36	61	0.01a 6-8
22	24	47	0.01a 6-8
22	18	80	0.01a-0.02 Bennet-Schoelline
20	28	46	0.01a 6-8
TECHNICAL COUNTS			
22 22	28 28	172	0.01a 6-8
18	20	172	0.01a 6-8
21	21	98	0.01a 6-8
22	28	702	0.01a-0.02 Bennet-Schoelline
22	28	98	0.01a 6-8
18	28	32	0.01a 6-8
Level 10, to Singling at Level 10			
Level 20, to Singling at Level 20			

TABLE VII

Test	Number	A through C/ vs. C through D	A through B vs. C/ through D
TECHNICAL MECHANICAL DRAWING			
Otis Q-S	102	.36 **	.10
Minn. P.F.B.	102	.27 **	.31 **
Bennett Mech.	77	.32 **	.23 **
Foult-Schorling	85	.44 **	.32 **
Iowa Algebra	76	.36 **	.23 #
TECHNICAL APPLIED PHYSICS			
Otis Q-S	86	.19	.32 **
Minn. P.F.B.	86	-.03	.21 #
Bennett Mech.	64	.18	.28 #
Foult-Schorling	72	.39 **	.42 **
Iowa Algebra	63	.45 **	.46 **
TECHNICAL ELECTRICITY			
Otis Q-S	86	.24 #	.16
Minn. P.F.B.	86	.38 **	.31 **
Bennett Mech.	64	.25 #	.46 **
Foult-Schorling	72	.30 #	.50 **
Iowa Algebra	63	.29 #	.54 **
TECHNICAL ELECTRICAL MOTOR LAB.			
Otis Q-S	86	.16	.24 #
Minn. P.F.B.	86	.15	.21 #
Bennett Mech.	64	.18	.27 #
Foult-Schorling	72	.08	.23
Iowa Algebra	63	.18	.15

\*\* Significant at .01 level

# Significant at .05 level

TABLE A11

Level	Level 10	Level 20	Level 30	Level 40
TECHNICAL MECHANICAL DRAWINGS				
10.	** 26.	26	102	2-9 6-8
** 27.	** 27.	27	102	Min. 5.5.5
** 28.	** 28.	28	27	Benefit Meep
** 29.	** 29.	29	28	Power-Sensitivity
% 29.	** 29.	29	27	Two Trieps
TECHNICAL APPENDIX DRAWINGS				
** 29.	10.	28	28	2-9 6-8
% 31.	20.-	28	28	5.5.5.5
% 32.	21.	28	28	Benefit Meep
** 33.	** 28.	27	27	Power-Sensitivity
% 34.	** 29.	28	28	Two Trieps
TECHNICAL ELECTRICAL				
21.	% 28.	28	28	2-9 6-8
% 22.	** 28.	28	28	5.5.5.5
% 24.	% 28.	28	28	Benefit Meep
** 25.	% 28.	27	27	Power-Sensitivity
% 26.	% 28.	28	28	Two Trieps
TECHNICAL ELECTRICAL MACH				
% 28.	21.	28	28	2-9 6-8
% 29.	21.	28	28	5.5.5.5
% 32.	21.	28	28	Benefit Meep
22.	20.	27	27	Power-Sensitivity
21.	21.	28	28	Two Trieps

Level 10. is drawing is \*\*  
 Level 20. is drawing is %

and .24 and .50\*\* in MC, SDE, and EC courses. The Foust-Schorling differentiated between technical courses .46\*\* and .41\*\* and the MC, SDE, and EC courses .61\*\* and .38\*\*; as did the Iowa Algebra with .42\*\* and .32\*\* in technical courses as opposed to .53\*\* and .40\*\* in MC, SDE, and EC courses.

When we get into the prediction in the individual subject area we see that in technical mathematics (Table VI) the Foust-Schorling with .22# and .43\*\* and the Iowa Algebra with .36\*\* and .44\*\* are the best with the Otis Q-S of .25\*\* and .28\*\* a poor second. Neither the Minnesota nor the Bennett are of much significance in this subject.

Technical mechanical drawing and technical electricity (Table VII) show the most consistently significant correlations of any criterion, although to be sure most of them are below the level that could be termed marked correlation. Those above the level of .40 are .44\*\* and .32\*\* between Foust-Schorling and technical mechanical drawing, .30# and .50\*\* between Foust-Schorling and technical electricity, and .29# and .54\*\* between Iowa Algebra and technical electricity. Technical applied physics (Table VII) shows .39\*\* and .42\*\* with the Foust-Schorling and .45\*\* and .46\*\* with the



Iowa Algebra test.

TABLE VIII

Test	Number	A through C/ vs. C through D	A through B vs. C/ through D
TECHNICAL MACHINE WORK			
Otis Q-S	74	.03	-.06
Minn. P.F.B.	74	.04	.21
Bennett Mech.	58	.10	.00
Foust-Schorling	61	.00	-.19
Iowa Algebra	57	-.11	-.16
TECHNICAL PATTERNMAKING			
Otis Q-S	74	.06	.03
Minn. P.F.B.	74	.48 **	.28 #
Bennett Mech.	58	.38 **	.64 **
Foust-Schorling	59	-.12	-.14
Iowa Algebra	56	-.17	-.04
TECHNICAL WELDING			
Otis Q-S	77	.06	.09
Minn. P.F.B.	77	.19	.20
Bennett Mech.	60	.10	.28 #
Foust-Schorling	63	.07	.25 #
Iowa Algebra	59	-.10	.11
TECHNICAL ENGLISH			
Otis Q-S	91	.38 **	.46 **
Minn. P.F.B.	90	-.13	.04
Bennett Mech.	68	-.13	-.10
Foust-Schorling	71	.11	.08
Iowa Algebra	64	.17	-.01

\*\* Significant at .01 level

# Significant at .05 level

## TAPES AIII

Group A	Group B	Group C	Group D	Group E
SYNTHETIC MARCHING BROW				
80.-	80.	74	80	8-9 610
81.	80.	74	80	8-9 611
80.	70.	80	80	8-9 612
81.-	80.	81	80	8-9 613
81.-	71.-	80	80	8-9 614
SYNTHETIC PATTERNING				
80.	80.	74	80	8-9 615
82.	80.	74	80	8-9 616
80.	80.	80	80	8-9 617
81.-	81.-	80	80	8-9 618
80.-	71.-	80	80	8-9 619
SYNTHETIC MELTING				
80.	80.	77	80	8-9 620
80.	70.	77	80	8-9 621
80.	70.	80	80	8-9 622
80.	70.	83	80	8-9 623
71.	70.	80	80	8-9 624
SYNTHETIC LENGTHEN				
** 84.	** 82.	70	80	8-9 625
84.	73.	80	80	8-9 626
70.	72.	80	80	8-9 627
80.	71.	81	80	8-9 628
70.	71.	84	80	8-9 629

level 10. to 100% of level  
level 80. to 100% of level

Iowa Algebra test.

TABLE IX

With exceptions the general pattern in the individual technical subjects is higher correlation in those which seem to have more academic factors included (Table VI through VIII). Technical English shows only the Otis Q-S .38\*\* and .46\*\* as significant which would seem to indicate that the test battery was aimed in general at a technical ~~actrade~~ curriculum rather than at ~~an~~ academic curriculum. While in the technical electrical motor laboratory, technical machine work, technical patternmaking and technical welding the only tests significant at the one percent level are the Minnesota .48\*\* and .28# and the Bennett .38\*\* and .64\*\* with the technical patternmaking. Pending further studies the expected result would seem to be that different tests were needed to predict in the laboratory as opposed to the classroom subjects. Whether this would hold up under further research could only be answered in the future.

In Table IX the results of the various criteria in the trade courses and subjects are indicated. The general patterning of test prediction in trade courses is not too dissimilar to that in technical courses as the mathematics tests give better results than the



others. The Purdue and Thurstone, the Thor-

TABLE IX

Test	Number	A through C vs. C through D	A through B vs. C through D
TRADE COURSES			
Otis Q-S	46	.35 #	.35 #
Minn. P.F.B.	46	.39 **	.35 #
Bennett Mech.	38	-.04	.02
Purdue Indust.	36	.35 #	.57 **
Otis Arith.	29	.35	.32
Thurstone Arith.	36	.51 **	.65 **
TRADE MATHEMATICS			
Otis Q-S	46	-.09	.33 #
Minn. P.F.B.	46	.30 #	.50 **
Bennett Mech.	38	-.45 **	-.22
Purdue Indust.	36	.29	-.01
Otis Arith.	29	.34	.36
Thurstone Arith.	36	.20	.00
TRADE MECHANICAL DRAWING			
Otis Q-S	30	-.04	.19
Minn. P.F.B.	30	-.10	-.02
TRADE APPLIED PHYSICS			
Otis Q-S	46	.33 #	.26
Minn. P.F.B.	46	.37 #	.15
Bennett Mech.	38	-.22	-.27
Purdue Indust.	36	.35 #	.46 **
Otis Arith.	29	.20	.18
Thurstone Arith.	36	.48 **	.52 **

\*\* Significant at .01 level. The intention here was

# Significant at .05 level. Various elements of the test

TABLE IX

A proportion of the sample	A proportion of the sample	Number	Leaf
STAGE COURSES			
28	28	28	Offia 6-8
28	28	28	Minu 6-8
28	28	28	Bennet 6-8
28	28	28	Parade 6-8
28	28	28	Offia 6-8
28	28	28	Minu 6-8
28	28	28	Bennet 6-8
28	28	28	Parade 6-8
28	28	28	Offia 6-8
28	28	28	Minu 6-8
28	28	28	Bennet 6-8
BOTTAMENTHAR ROAST			
28	28	28	Offia 6-8
28	28	28	Minu 6-8
28	28	28	Bennet 6-8
28	28	28	Parade 6-8
28	28	28	Offia 6-8
28	28	28	Minu 6-8
28	28	28	Bennet 6-8
28	28	28	Parade 6-8
THINNED MELTING			
28	28	28	Offia 6-8
28	28	28	Minu 6-8
THINNED MELTING			
28	28	28	Offia 6-8
28	28	28	Minu 6-8
28	28	28	Bennet 6-8
28	28	28	Parade 6-8
28	28	28	Offia 6-8
28	28	28	Minu 6-8
28	28	28	Bennet 6-8
28	28	28	Parade 6-8

Simplifying of 10 level

Simplifying of 20 level

others. The Purdue shows .35# and .57\*\*, the Thurstone Arithmetic .51\*\* and .65\*\* while the Otis Q-S shows .35# and .35#, the Minnesota .39\*\* and .35#, and the Bennett -.04 and .02 with all trade courses. Trade applied physics shows roughly the same pattern as trade courses as a whole. Trade mathematics is surprising in that the arithmetic tests show no significant correlation while the Minnesota shows .30# and .50\*\* and the Bennett shows -.45\*\* and -.22. Trade mechanical drawing had only two tests that had sufficient numbers to run correlations, the Otis Q-S and the Minnesota, and neither of these came even close to having significant results. Since the numbers in the trade groups are even smaller than in the technical, any results are less meaningful, even though the use of the null hypothesis in the testing of the significance of the obtained correlation balances some of this. The need for further study is especially apparent in the trade course area.

Table X shows the inter-correlations between the various tests of the battery. The intention here was to see to what extent the various elements of the test battery were dependent on common factors. The product-moment correlations were used in this table. The



highest correlation was

TABLE X

Otis Arith. INTERCORRELATIONS OF THE VARIOUS TESTS

Tests	Number	r
Otis Q-S versus Minn. P.F. Bd.	179	.17 #
Bennett Mech.	137	.33 **
Purdue Indust.	41	.18
Otis Arith.	66	.71 **
Thurstone Arith.	41	.47 **
Fouest-Schorling	111	.57 **
Iowa Algebra	97	.66 **
Minn. P. F. Bd. versus Bennett Mech.	137	.23 **
Purdue Indust.	41	.21
Otis Arith.	66	.03
Thurstone Arith.	41	.24
Fouest-Schorling	111	.08
Iowa Algebra	97	.12
Bennett Mech. versus Purdue Indust.	39	.05
Thurstone Arith.	39	.09
Fouest-Schorling	111	.44 **
Iowa Algebra	97	.23 #
Purdue Indust. versus Thurstone Arith.	41	.65 ** .17
Fouest-Schorling versus Iowa Algebra	97	.69 **

\*\* Significant at the .01 level

# Significant at the .05 level

If we try to match the test intercorrelations against the prediction of the tests with the various

X

TABLE X

INTERCORRELATIONS OF THE VARIOUS TESTS

Test	Number	Test
66 71.	176	Oct 19 6-8 veterans
66 72.	177	Mar 19 6-8, 19
66 73.	178	Bennetts Mexican
66 74.	179	Prudhoe Ingraham
66 75.	180	Oct 19 1918
66 76.	181	Montezuma Alton
66 77.	182	Bonac-Schouten
66 78.	183	Iowa Aldepera
66 79.	184	
66 80.	185	
66 81.	186	
66 82.	187	
66 83.	188	
66 84.	189	
66 85.	190	
66 86.	191	
66 87.	192	
66 88.	193	
66 89.	194	
66 90.	195	
66 91.	196	
66 92.	197	
66 93.	198	
66 94.	199	
66 95.	200	
66 96.	201	
66 97.	202	
66 98.	203	
66 99.	204	
66 100.	205	
66 101.	206	
66 102.	207	
66 103.	208	
66 104.	209	
66 105.	210	
66 106.	211	
66 107.	212	
66 108.	213	
66 109.	214	
66 110.	215	
66 111.	216	
66 112.	217	
66 113.	218	
66 114.	219	
66 115.	220	
66 116.	221	
66 117.	222	
66 118.	223	
66 119.	224	
66 120.	225	
66 121.	226	
66 122.	227	
66 123.	228	
66 124.	229	
66 125.	230	
66 126.	231	
66 127.	232	
66 128.	233	
66 129.	234	
66 130.	235	
66 131.	236	
66 132.	237	
66 133.	238	
66 134.	239	
66 135.	240	
66 136.	241	
66 137.	242	
66 138.	243	
66 139.	244	
66 140.	245	
66 141.	246	
66 142.	247	
66 143.	248	
66 144.	249	
66 145.	250	
66 146.	251	
66 147.	252	
66 148.	253	
66 149.	254	
66 150.	255	
66 151.	256	
66 152.	257	
66 153.	258	
66 154.	259	
66 155.	260	
66 156.	261	
66 157.	262	
66 158.	263	
66 159.	264	
66 160.	265	
66 161.	266	
66 162.	267	
66 163.	268	
66 164.	269	
66 165.	270	
66 166.	271	
66 167.	272	
66 168.	273	
66 169.	274	
66 170.	275	
66 171.	276	
66 172.	277	
66 173.	278	
66 174.	279	
66 175.	280	
66 176.	281	
66 177.	282	
66 178.	283	
66 179.	284	
66 180.	285	
66 181.	286	
66 182.	287	
66 183.	288	
66 184.	289	
66 185.	290	
66 186.	291	
66 187.	292	
66 188.	293	
66 189.	294	
66 190.	295	
66 191.	296	
66 192.	297	
66 193.	298	
66 194.	299	
66 195.	300	
66 196.	301	
66 197.	302	
66 198.	303	
66 199.	304	
66 200.	305	
66 201.	306	
66 202.	307	
66 203.	308	
66 204.	309	
66 205.	310	
66 206.	311	
66 207.	312	
66 208.	313	
66 209.	314	
66 210.	315	
66 211.	316	
66 212.	317	
66 213.	318	
66 214.	319	
66 215.	320	
66 216.	321	
66 217.	322	
66 218.	323	
66 219.	324	
66 220.	325	
66 221.	326	
66 222.	327	
66 223.	328	
66 224.	329	
66 225.	330	
66 226.	331	
66 227.	332	
66 228.	333	
66 229.	334	
66 230.	335	
66 231.	336	
66 232.	337	
66 233.	338	
66 234.	339	
66 235.	340	
66 236.	341	
66 237.	342	
66 238.	343	
66 239.	344	
66 240.	345	
66 241.	346	
66 242.	347	
66 243.	348	
66 244.	349	
66 245.	350	
66 246.	351	
66 247.	352	
66 248.	353	
66 249.	354	
66 250.	355	
66 251.	356	
66 252.	357	
66 253.	358	
66 254.	359	
66 255.	360	
66 256.	361	
66 257.	362	
66 258.	363	
66 259.	364	
66 260.	365	
66 261.	366	
66 262.	367	
66 263.	368	
66 264.	369	
66 265.	370	
66 266.	371	
66 267.	372	
66 268.	373	
66 269.	374	
66 270.	375	
66 271.	376	
66 272.	377	
66 273.	378	
66 274.	379	
66 275.	380	
66 276.	381	
66 277.	382	
66 278.	383	
66 279.	384	
66 280.	385	
66 281.	386	
66 282.	387	
66 283.	388	
66 284.	389	
66 285.	390	
66 286.	391	
66 287.	392	
66 288.	393	
66 289.	394	
66 290.	395	
66 291.	396	
66 292.	397	
66 293.	398	
66 294.	399	
66 295.	400	
66 296.	401	
66 297.	402	
66 298.	403	
66 299.	404	
66 300.	405	
66 301.	406	
66 302.	407	
66 303.	408	
66 304.	409	
66 305.	410	
66 306.	411	
66 307.	412	
66 308.	413	
66 309.	414	
66 310.	415	
66 311.	416	
66 312.	417	
66 313.	418	
66 314.	419	
66 315.	420	
66 316.	421	
66 317.	422	
66 318.	423	
66 319.	424	
66 320.	425	
66 321.	426	
66 322.	427	
66 323.	428	
66 324.	429	
66 325.	430	
66 326.	431	
66 327.	432	
66 328.	433	
66 329.	434	
66 330.	435	
66 331.	436	
66 332.	437	
66 333.	438	
66 334.	439	
66 335.	440	
66 336.	441	
66 337.	442	
66 338.	443	
66 339.	444	
66 340.	445	
66 341.	446	
66 342.	447	
66 343.	448	
66 344.	449	
66 345.	450	
66 346.	451	
66 347.	452	
66 348.	453	
66 349.	454	
66 350.	455	
66 351.	456	
66 352.	457	
66 353.	458	
66 354.	459	
66 355.	460	
66 356.	461	
66 357.	462	
66 358.	463	
66 359.	464	
66 360.	465	
66 361.	466	
66 362.	467	
66 363.	468	
66 364.	469	
66 365.	470	
66 366.	471	
66 367.	472	
66 368.	473	
66 369.	474	
66 370.	475	
66 371.	476	
66 372.	477	
66 373.	478	
66 374.	479	
66 375.	480	
66 376.	481	
66 377.	482	
66 378.	483	
66 379.	484	
66 380.	485	
66 381.	486	
66 382.	487	
66 383.	488	
66 384.	489	
66 385.	490	
66 386.	491	
66 387.	492	
66 388.	493	
66 389.	494	
66 390.	495	
66 391.	496	
66 392.	497	
66 393.	498	
66 394.	499	
66 395.	500	
66 396.	501	
66 397.	502	
66 398.	503	
66 399.	504	
66 400.	505	
66 401.	506	
66 402.	507	
66 403.	508	
66 404.	509	
66 405.	510	
66 406.	511	
66 407.	512	
66 408.	513	
66 409.	514	
66 410.	515	
66 411.	516	
66 412.	517	
66 413.	518	
66 414.	519	
66 415.	520	
66 416.	521	
66 417.	522	
66 418.	523	
66 419.	524	
66 420.	525	
66 421.	526	
66 422.	527	
66 423.	528	
66 424.	529	
66 425.	530	
66 426.	531	
66 427.	532	
66 428.	533	
66 429.	534	
66 430.	535	
66 431.	536	
66 432.	537	
66 433.	538	
66 434.	539	
66 435.	540	
66 436.	541	
66 437.	542	
66 438.	543	
66 439.	544	
66 440.	545	
66 441.	546	
66 442.	547	
66 443.	548	
66 444.	549	
66 445.	550	
66 446.	551	
66 447.	552	
66 448.	553	
66 449.	554	
66 450.	555	
66 451.	556	
66 452.	557	
66 453.	558	
66 454.	559	
66 455.	560	
66 456.	561	
66 457.	562	
66 458.	563	
66 459.	564	
66 460.	565	
66 461.	566	
66 462.	567	
66 463.	568	
66 464.	569	
66 465.	570	
66 466.	571	
66 467.	572	
66 468.	573	
66 469.	574	
66 470.	575	
66 471.	576	
66 472.	577	
66 473.	578	
66 474.	579	
66 475.	580	
66 476.	581	
66 477.	582	
66 478.	583	
66 479.	584	
66 480.	585	
66 481.	586	
66 482.	587	
66 483.	588	
66 484.	589	
66 485.	590	
66 486.	591	
66 487.	592	
66 488.	593	
66 489.	594	
66 490.	595	
66 491.	596	
66 492.	597	

highest correlation was between the Otis Q-S and the Otis Arithmetic (.71\*\*) and as the Otis Arithmetic is test 5 of the Otis Group Intelligence Scale, advanced (an earlier test by Otis) this seems logical as a good percent of the items on the Q-S are arithmetic items of a similar type. The Otis Q-S in general correlates better with the mathematics and arithmetic tests than with the mechanical and spatial tests. The actual correlations show .17# with the Minnesota, .33\*\* with the Bennett, .71\*\* with the Otis Arithmetic, .47\*\* with the Thurstone Arithmetic, .57\*\* with the Foust-Schorling, and .66\*\* with the Iowa Algebra. The Foust-Schorling and the Iowa Algebra show an intercorrelation of .69\*\*. The Purdue Industrial and the Thurstone Arithmetic show .65\*\*. The Bennett Mechanical shows .44\*\* with the Foust-Scharling but only .23# with the Iowa Algebra. With the exception of .23\*\* with the Bennett and .17# with the Otis Q-S the Minnesota shows no significant correlation with the others. This might possibly indicate that it was the most independent item in the test battery.

If we try to match the test intercorrelations against the prediction of the tests with the various



criteria no clear pattern presents itself. Future research might help clarify this (or some other statistical method) but at present no valid conclusions could be drawn. The justification for studying a particular group of individuals is the hope that the knowledge gained will assist in understanding a similar group in the future. If we try to delude ourselves with a statement that our only interest is in the group under examination we become hopelessly academic in the worst sense of the word. Not that a pilot study such as this should expect to reach a level where generalizations could be formed that would apply to future applicants to this technical institute; but it should be so aimed that it could serve as the first rung of a ladder rather than be just an isolated chunk of wood.

The validity of extending generalizations derived from a study of any given group depends on the representativeness of the sample. The conclusions drawn from this sample could not be applied generally to either the general population, trade schools or other technical institutes as this is not a random sample of any of those groups. The question as to whether another group of students at this school could be predicted from this sample could only be determined by

leasit adnsepti paffeqs rass on aliedris  
-ate tenis ems no) alid qllis qfli dnteset  
anolemonc bilav on fneetq is fud (bodis isvialif  
mewib ad blucc

studying several success CHAPTER V. In other words, the representativeness CONCLUSIONS up cannot be proved without further research. For one thing this is largely

The justification for studying a particular group of individuals is the hope that the knowledge gained will assist in understanding a similar group in the future. If we try to delude ourselves with a statement that our only interest is in the group under examination we become hopelessly academic in the worst sense of the word. Not that a pilot study such as this should expect to reach a level where generalizations could be formed that would apply to future applicants to this technical institute; but it should be so aimed that it could serve as the first rung of a ladder rather than be just an isolated chunk of wood.

The validity of extending generalizations derived from a study of any given group depends on the representativeness of the sample. The conclusions drawn from this sample could not be applied generally to either the general population, trade schools or other technical institutes as this is not a random sample of any of those groups. The question as to whether another group of students at this school could be predicted from this sample could only be determined by

quoty mervairies a galibies tot polisitissat er  
banty eypelwom edt jant yod edt si alambivihai lo  
ans si quoy valkis a galibieserewm si jalesas lliw  
cunemera a dliw zevleusno abuies edt yliw aw li  
-animese teneb quoys edt si si faetensn yliw tuo teneb  
essas jafow edt si cimessas yliwesqes poylesqes smood edt nolt  
blwom sids as dous ybysa jafow a jant jol . brou edt lo  
ed blwos anolissateneb etewi level a nolt ed jocqes  
sids as anolissateneb etewi of yliw blwos jadd hemiok  
si jadd hemis as ed blwos si jad ; cimatisi lesinides  
nent teneb teneb a lo yant teneb edt as evtes blwos  
boow lo khudo beslooi as jant ed  
bavirab anolissateneb galibies lo yliwesqes edt  
-etewi edt as abuies quoys nevys yliw lo yliw a mott  
nwatb anolissateneb edt . alqas edt lo anolissateneb  
as yliwesqes beliqes edt jad blwos sids as mott  
teneb as alqas abuies , poliyalqesqes fateresqes edt teneb  
lo sids mottas a jad si sids as beslurant lesinides  
-as teneb of as poliyalqesqes edt . alqas edt lo yliw  
-etewi edt blwos lesinides sids as anolissateneb lo quoys teneb  
yliw beslurant as yliw blwos sids mott beslurant

studying several successive classes. In other words, the representativeness of this group cannot be proved without further research. For one thing this is largely a veteran group so that prediction of success for a group just out of high school might be a different matter. One question might be whether a group of students just out of school might not make a significantly higher score on a mathematics test than those who had been out of school for a few years. This writer's guess would be that the scores would be higher, but it might be that it would be an even, over-all increase that would not appreciably affect the correlations with the criterion. Here again future study holds the answer. ~~the next study at this school gave similar~~

The ability of a given test to predict success in a given subject is of interest from the point of view of further research more than for any other single reason. This ability to predict in a given subject would be of little use to the admissions committee unless it were possible to predict in all subjects in a course and then by weighting the tests arrive at a pattern that would be of assistance. The ability to predict a subject or two out of a course is an indication that we are perhaps on the right road but it is



not sufficient to base any judgment for potential success of future students. This ability to predict in one subject and not in another should with study have certain implications as to additions necessary to the test battery before adequate prognostications can be accomplished.

One distinct limitation of this study is that the largest group has only one hundred seventy-nine students and when we reach the individual subjects the numbers are in the realm of rather small sample theory. As a pilot study, however, this writer feels that the correlations run on these small groups are well worth the labor involved.

If the next study at this school gave similar results the obtained correlations could be considered quite promising. Considering that the criterion was school success in terms of grades the results correspond quite well with previous research. No attempt was made to see whether a given test predicted any particular "aptitude." The problem was solely the question of whether success in school could be predicted with the criterion of marks and a battery of group tests. Any other criterion would be primarily theoretical as the success of future students would be based on their

—own Leisures tot bennachur yna easd of theicilive ton  
ni foling of yllid aift . athena exult to eas  
eas yndi nifw binne redonu ni ton yna teelidu eas  
ed of yllasen anoliba of na anolilidu nist  
ed na anolilidu bont eanreba arof yllasen  
paff paffed

bedilqwoos

adit jedit ai yndi aift to notatimli tonidai an  
anlebuda enli-yntneva berbau an yllo anq qvotg fassat  
atepnu an aseidua fassatibai anq aseid anq nedu bau  
a an . yntoed elqmas llens tafet to miset anq ni ova  
-cor adit jedit aseid tafet wifit aift . reviewor yndi jollq  
enq nifw llew anq aqoutg llens esed anq anolilidu

bedilovaai rada

tafimia evag loodas aift de yndi xan adi II  
benebisanoo ed yllo anolilidu beniddo adi edilas  
ew polerlou ed tafet qntabedibai . qntabedibai aifup  
-cor anolilidu adi aebatu to aseid an aseid loodas  
yndi an . nolaseet anolilidu yllo llew aifup bnoqset  
-ber yndi beolilidu just nevir a tafimia eas of abem eas  
nolaseup adi yllo anq aseid yllo "ebutidu"  
yllo beolilidu ad yllo loodas at aseid tafedw to  
aft aqoutg to qntabed a yndi anolilidu to aolilidu adi  
an fassatidu yllo anolilidu ad yllo aolilidu tafet yndi  
aft anolilidu to aseid tafet yllo anolilidu to aseid

school marks. The fact that the only significant correlation found with the technical English was with the Otis Q-S might be an indication that in general the battery was reasonably well aimed at a technical curriculum.

The fact that a group selected for entrance to a technical institute is in all probability a rather homogeneous sample makes the fact that several correlations above .40 were found a rather encouraging factor.

The largest unanswered question is why a test predicts at one division point and not at the other. At present no answer that is more than a guess could be put forth. It certainly is one problem area that should be explored thoroughly.

Finally, could the answer. The Otis Q-S may correlate better with a type of ability not essential in a school of this type. The civilian edition of the Army General Classification Test might be worth a trial. The Chicago Primary Mental Abilities is probably too long to be used as an admissions test in its present form, unless experimentation with the students indicated that certain sections were useful. The Otis Arithmetic test could probably be discarded from further research.

-too describing who will teach what and when  
and how new findings. Incidence of new know not what  
and latency of such knowledge not as of drug 2-0 also  
-the incidence of the bombs flew widespread and  
-and the number  
of some to be expected about a year past and  
there is a difference in the number of students  
-the future that past and when others are engaged  
-and the number of new or new Dr. avoid smoking  
-and past a few at no time between us and  
the students who are the only knowable who are  
and those among a number whom the past  
and some smoking who are the first to be  
-and the number of new or new Dr. avoid smoking

## CHAPTER VI

## SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The first recommendation would be that in further research the test battery be both varied and expanded.

In the first instance it might well be profitable to experiment with other measures of spatial relations, such as the Spatial Relations part of the Chicago Primary Mental Abilities test or Ruch's Survey of Space Relations as examples. A more difficult mechanical test such as form BB of the Bennett might be worth the trial, or possibly some other type such as the Purdue Mechanical Adaptability test might give better results. Some other measure of general mental ability should be tried, even though the possibility exists that specialized ability could be the answer. The Otis Q-S may correlate better with a type of ability not essential in a school of this type. The civilian edition of the Army General Classification Test might be worth a trial.

The Chicago Primary Mental Abilities is probably too long to be used as an admissions test in its present form, unless experimentation with the students indicated that certain sections were useful. The Otis Arithmetic test could probably be discarded from further research



without serious loss as no correlations were found that were significant at the one percent level. Both the Foust-Schorling and the Iowa Algebra would seem from present results to be worth inclusion in any future test battery. Other tests of a similar type and a commensurate difficulty level might well be experimented with however to see if improvement in prediction could be achieved with a different test. The Purdue Industrial test might be improved in prediction if both forms were given, or if a similar test of greater difficulty were discovered. If the latter, it might be interesting to try it on the technical group also. The Thurstone Arithmetic test might also be usable for the technical group as the mean for the trade group was rather low. The element in common in both of these last-mentioned tests seems from inspection to be that of problem solving. If other tests involving arithmetic problem solving of a suitable difficulty level cannot be obtained commercially it might be worth the effort to develop one especially for this school. Empirically at least problem solving would seem to be inherent in some of these showing the best obtained correlations. The Foust-Schorling seems to have some of this also but in



addition relies on some knowledge of algebra fundamentals.

In further research it might return interesting results if the good versus the poor students were matched against the individual test items rather than against the total test score. Machine calculation would be essential if this were to be done economically from either a time or financial point of view.

Another technique that should certainly be tried in the future would be that of multiple correlation. It could be that some other weighting (once adequate prediction in individual subjects was obtained) might offer the best chances for selection of the students with the best potentiality for success. Only future research holds the answer to that. The present study gives no indication as to how much, if any, we could increase group prediction by the combination of tests that is inherent in a multiple correlation technique.

It might be worth while to investigate other areas in any future study. The immediate ones in mind are those of interest and personality. Whether such a test prior to entrance would give valid results has some elements of doubt but should be worth the experimental effort. The element of personality that would



seem to be of value is whether we could gain any indication as to whether a student would or could make use of the potentiality shown in the other tests. Working with the actual data it is always interesting to see the cases that are way out of expectation, both high and low, and to speculate on the reason therefore. In a way this could be termed school-room personality. The way that this differs from school-room ability is obvious to all the better teachers. The possibility exists that the ability to get along with the teacher indicates a similar ability to get along with the foremen and superintendents in industry. The measurement of interest might result in a slight overall increase in the ability to predict success. It might weed out a few persons who, due to inadequate occupational information, were tackling a program that was entirely out of line with their basic pattern. Interest ideally would be connected with the drive for success but to what extent any present test would measure this aspect is at the least questionable.

Thus the question arises as to what extent present tests are capable of adequate group prediction of school success, individual prediction being obviously out of the realm of statistical practicality. The



element of error for selection of successful students is so large in this present experiment, and in most previous ones, that on the basis of this single study no concrete recommendations could be safely made to an admissions committee, except that the road seemed promising for further travel. The problem has only been scratched but the writer feels that continued work would be most profitable in returns both to the school and to the prospective students. The ideal conclusion would be when the results had wide implications for the guidance of youth in general.

The best result that should be expected from a pilot study could well be compared to an artillery battery that fires the first few rounds to bracket the target before it fires for effect. This study compares to the first round fired in that advance calculations were made but the report of the forward observer must be given as to where it landed in relation to the target before we can correct our aim. Fortunately this first round landed where its relation to the target could be seen. The next step in a gun battery is to adjust the calculations and fire another round. Here the calculations are not so easily adjusted but we do the best we can. The next step then is to "fire another round" and

addebuta inlassesca to noldoless tol mottu to gnomelio  
daco ni hna ,gnomelio gnomelio sind ni egini as et  
vnuis algnis sind to elazd edd no fadz ,zeno anolverq  
na as sham ylites ed hnuos anolivnemmoer ejeromos on  
-morg bennas laot edd tadt qdeoxa ,setzimmo anolivnem  
neso qfno and maldorq edT .Invanz meddint tol gal  
-tow beranitmos fadz alces zefitw edd jnd berodaros  
loodos edd ed drod anitwet al eldatillorq jasow ed hnuos  
gnomeliosca isabt edT .gnomeliosca ejeromos edd of hna  
edd tol anolivnemmo eble han ejeromos edd medw ed hnuos  
-tow beranitmos fadz alces zefitw edd jnd berodaros  
-pap qzefitw na of beranitmos ed illew hnuos qfnoe foliq  
-etit deisord ed ahvor vel jariT edd ariT fadz tol  
-etxanmos qfnoe alit .jefitw tol ariT ti eroted jefitw  
-anolivnemmo eonavha fadz hi berit hnuot jariT edd of  
-dram tenvedo hnuot edd to droget edd jnd sham crew  
-jefitw edd of noitafet al bebnai ti eritw ed as nevly ed  
-jefitw sind qfnoe .mis dno foerwos dno ew eroted  
ed hnuos jefitw edd of noitafet al eritw bebnai hanot  
edd hanot as el qfnoe and a ni qfnoe jxen edT .neva  
-nolivnemmo and erit .hnuot reditons erit hna anolivnemmo  
ew fadz edd ob ew jnd beranitmos qfnoe as han era anoliv  
hna "hanot reditons erit" as el nent qfnoe jxen edT .nec

see if we bracket the target. Only when this is done can we tell whether to fire for effect or to adjust and try again. The encouraging factor is that this first shot was within sight of the target and not over the next hill and out of sight.

~~by T. S. Bingham, Preliminary Report, Psychological Corporation, New York, 1942.~~

Bingham, W. V. Aptitudes and Aptitude Testing, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1937.

Bingham, W. V. D., and Freud, M. Procedures in Employment Psychology, A. W. Knopf Company, New York, 1936.

Brown, M. B. Educational Statistics, American Book Company, New York, 1936.

Buros, O. K., ed. 1938 Mental Measurements Yearbook, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1938.

The 1940 Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highwood Park, New Jersey, 1941.

Derley, John G. Testing and Counseling in the High School Guidance Program, Science Research Associates, Chicago, 1938.

Garrett, R. H. Statistics in Psychology and Education, Third Edition, Longmans, Green and Company, New York, 1947.

Garrett, R. H., and Schneek, M. R. Psychological Testing, Methods, and Results, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1938.

Guidance Implications from Measurements of Achievement, Abilities, and Interest, University Bureau of Educational Reference and Research (Bulletin #155), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1944.

anok si sindi neni yitQ . segiat edd tenebrii sw li sea  
bns tenebrii od ro jocelii rok erli et tenebrii wlel et ne  
jocelii siids jadd si jocelii unigatmoone edT . misga vrd  
edd tenebrii jocelii segiat edd ro jocelii nidiwi sw jocelii  
jocelii ro jocelii bns lliid jxen

APPENDIX A  
BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BOOKS

Bennett, G. K., and Cruikshank, R. M. A Summary of Manual and Mechanical Ability Tests (Preliminary Form), Psychological Corporation, New York, 1942

Bingham, W. V. Aptitudes and Aptitude Testing, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1937

Bingham, W. V. D., and Freyd, M. Procedures in Employment Psychology, A. W. Shaw Company, New York, 1926

Broom, M. E. Educational Statistics, American Book Company, New York, 1936

Buros, O. K., ed. 1938 Mental Measurements Yearbook, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1938

. The 1940 Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, 1941

Darley, John G. Testing and Counseling in the High School Guidance Program, Science Research Associates, Chicago, 1945

Garrett, H. E. Statistics in Psychology and Education, Third Edition, Longmans, Green and Company, New York, 1947

Garrett, H. E., and Schneck, M. R. Psychological Tests, Methods, and Results, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1933

Guidance Implications from Measurements of Achievements, Aptitudes, and Interest, University Bureau of Educational Reference and Research (Bulletin #156), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1944



Hildreth, G. A. A Bibliography of Mental Tests and Rating Scales, Second Edition, Psychological Corporation, New York, 1939

Hull, C. L. Aptitude Testing, World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1928

Kelley, T. L. Statistical Method, New York, 1923

Morton, N. W. Individual Diagnosis;; A Manual for the Employment Office, McGill University, Montreal, 1937

. Occupational Abilities; a Study of Unemployed Men, Oxford University Press, Toronto, 1936

Paterson, D. G., Elliott, R. M., et al. Minnesota Mechanical Ability Tests, University of Minnesota Press, 1930

Paterson, D. G., Schneidler, G. G., and Williamson, E. G. Student Guidance Techniques, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1938

Ruch, Floyd. How To Use Employment Tests, California, Test Bureau, Los Angeles, 1943

Rugg, H. O. Statistical Methods Applied to Education, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1917

Stead, W. H., Shartle, C.L., et al. Occupational Counseling Techniques, American Book Company, New York, 1940

Strang, Ruth. Personal Development and Guidance in College and Secondary School, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1934

Vocational-Technical Training for Industrial Occupations, Report of the Consulting Committee on Vocational-Technical Training appointed by the United States Commissioner of Education, Vocational Division Bulletin #228, United States Office of Education, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1944

(1942), 26, 468-70



## II. PERIODICALS

Beekley, D. K., and Smith, L. F. "Test Forms for Use in Vocational Education," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, (February, 1947), 35, 56-9

Bennett, G. K., and Cruikshank, R. M. "Sex Differences in Understanding of Mechanical Problems," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1942), 26, 121-7

\_\_\_\_\_, and Fear, R. A. "Mechanical Comprehension and Dexterity," Personnel Journal, (1943), 22, 12-17

Blum, M. L. "Selection of Sewing Machine Operators," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1943), 27, 35-40

Brush, E. N. "Mechanical Ability as a Factor in Engineering Aptitude," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1941), 25, 300-12

Chapanis, A. "Note on Validity and Difficulty of Items in Form A of Otis S-A Mental Ability Test," Journal of Experimental Education, (1947), 5, 246-8

Cooper, C. L. "Mechanical Aptitude and School Achievement of Negro Boys," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1936), 20, 751-60

Crooks, W. R., and Ferguson, L. W. "Item Validities of the Otis Test of Mental Ability for a College Population," Journal of Experimental Education, (1941), 9, 229-32

Frandsen, A. N., and Hadley, J. M. "The Prediction of Achievement in a Radio Training School," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1943), 27, 303-10

French, J. M. "Value of Tests and Teachers Marks as a Means of Predicting the Success of Pupils in High School," Abstract, Department of Secondary School Principals B, (1929), 24, 61-3

Ghiselli, E. E. "Tests for the Selection of Inspector-Packers," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1942), 26, 468-76

II. PERIODICALS

Beekley, D. K. and Smith, P. E. "Teac Pottery for  
Use in Acculturation Research" Archaeology, 25, 28-9  
(1972).

Bennett, G. K. and Chiriboga, R.  
"Cultural Isolation of Mestizos in  
Venezuela" Latin American Anthropology, 13, 25-32  
(1971).

and Best, H. A. "Mestizo Cultural Compromission  
and Perfection" Second Journal, 12-13, 28  
(1943).

Blum, M. I. "Society to which Mestizos Belong"  
Journal of Applied Ethnology, 10, 38-40  
(1963).

Burkhardt, W. E. "Mestizo Isolation"  
"Beliefs of Mestizos in Central America"  
Journal of Applied Ethnology, 15, 200-12  
(1941).

Gooden, C. P. "Mestizo  
Beliefs in Latin America" Journal of Applied  
Ethnology, 10, 201-02  
(1963).

Groves, W. L. "Mestizo Beliefs in  
Argentina" Journal of Applied Ethnology, 10, 203-04  
(1963).

Hernandez, A. L. "Mestizo Beliefs in  
Argentina" Journal of Applied Ethnology, 10, 205-06  
(1963).

Hernandez, A. L. "Mestizo Beliefs in  
Argentina" Journal of Applied Ethnology, 10, 207-08  
(1963).

Hernandez, A. L. "Mestizo Beliefs in  
Argentina" Journal of Applied Ethnology, 10, 209-10  
(1963).

Gottsdanker, R. M. "Measures of Potentiality for Machine Calculation," Bibliography, Journal of Applied Psychology, (1943), 27, 233-48

Guiler, W. S. "The Predictive Value of Group Intelligence Tests," Journal of Educational Research (1927), 16, 365-74

Guilford, J. P., and Zimmerman, W. S. "Some AAF Findings Concerning Aptitude Factors," Occupations, (1947), 26, 154-59

Hall, O. M. "An Aid to the Selection of Pressman Apprentices," Personnel Journal, (1933), 9, 77-81

Hanmon, B. "The Performance of Adult Males on the Minnesota Paper Form Test and the O'Rourke Mechanical Aptitude Test," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1942), 26, 809-11

Harrell, W. "A Factor Analysis of Mechanical Ability Tests," Psychometrika, (1940), 5, 17-33

Harrell, Willard, and Faubian, "Selection Tests for Aviation Mechanics," Journal of Consulting Psychology, (1940), 4, 104-110

Hershey, J. O. "The Practical Adaptation of Counseling and Testing to an Industrial School," Educational and Psychological Measurements, (1946) 6, 93-97

Hovland, C. I., and Wonderlic, E. F. "A Critical Analysis of the Otis Test of Mental Ability," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1939), 23, 367-87

Hunter, R. S. "Aptitude Tests for the Machine Shop," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, (1945), 34, 58-63

Hutson, P. W., and Webster, A. D. "An Experiment in the Educational and Vocational Guidance of Tenth Grade Pupils," Educational and Psychological Measurements, (1943), 3, 3-21



Jacobsen, "Evaluation of Certain Tests in Predicting Mechanical Learner Achievement," Educational and Psychological Measurements, (1943), 3, 259-67

Lange, I. D. "Value of Otis Test of Mental Ability as a Measure of Predicting the Success of Pupils in Junior High School," Department of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, (1929), 24, 65-9

Langlie, T. A. "What Is Measured by the Iowa Aptitude Tests," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1929), 13, 589-91

Lawshe, C. H., Jr. "Purdue Industrial Training Classification Test," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1942), 26, 770-6

, and others. "Purdue Mechanical Adaptability Test," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1946), 30, 442-52

, and Thornton, G. R. "A Test Battery for Identifying Potentially Successful Naval Electrical Trainees," Journal of Applied Psychology, 27, 399-406

Likert, R. "A Multiple Choice Revision of the Minnesota Paper Form Board Test," Psychological Bulletin, (1934), 31, 674-79

Mann, C. V. "Engineering Aptitudes; Their Definition, Measurement, and Use," Journal of Engineering Education, (1942), 32, 673-86

Mathewson, R. H. "Aptitude Tests and Trade School Adjustment," Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, (1944), 33, 400-2

McDaniel, J. W., and Reynolds, W. A. "Study of Use of Mechanical Aptitude Tests in Selection of Trainees for Mechanical Occupations," Educational and Psychological Measurements, (1944), 4, 191-7

McGehee, W., and Moffie, D. J. "Psychological Test in the Selection of Enrollees in Engineering, Science, Management, Defense Training Courses," Journal of Applied Psychology, 26, 584-86



Mitrano, A. J. "The Relationship between Age and Test Performance of Applicants to a Technical-Industrial High School," Journal of Applied Psychology, 26, 482-86

Moore, B. V. "Analysis of Results of Tests Administered to Men in Engineering Defense Training Courses," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1941), 25, 619-35

Morgan, W. J. "Some Remarks and Results of Aptitude Testing in Technical and Industrial Schools," Journal of Social Psychology, (1944), 20, 19-29

Quasha, W. H., and Likert, R. "The Revised Minnesota Paper Form Board Test," Journal of Educational Psychology, (1937), 28, 197-204

Richardson and Stalnaker, "A Note on the Use of Bi-serial  $r$  in Test Research," Journal of General Psychology, (1933), 8, 463-65

Simpson, R. M. "The Mechanical Aptitude of 312 Prisoners," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1932), 16, 485-96

Stay, E. G. "Tests for Mechanical Drawing Aptitude," Personnel Journal, (1928), 6, 93-101

Stuit, D. B., and Lapp, C. J. "Some Factors in Physics Achievement at the College Level," Journal of Experimental Education, (1941), 9, 251-53

Thompson, C. E. "Motor and Mechanical Abilities in Professional Schools," Journal of Applied Psychology, 26, 24-36

Tiffin, J., and Greenly, R. J. "Employee Selection Tests for Electrical Fixture Assemblers and Radio Assemblers," Journal of Applied Psychology, 23, 240-63

Toops, H. S. "The Criterion," Educational and Psychological Measurements, (1944), 4, 271-97

line sua necessitated classification of T. A. unpublished  
-symbol-Ischindel's as of significance to communications  
,08 psychology beliefs to Ischindel", psychology beliefs  
88-284

-psychology ideas to education to psychology" V. E. Wood  
" psychology beliefs beliefs psychology beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs  
88-918-88 (1881) psychology beliefs to Ischindel

psychology to education psychology beliefs" L. W. Morgan  
Ischindel", psychology beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs  
88-918-88 (1881) psychology beliefs to Ischindel

-psychology beliefs beliefs" R. A. and M. H. Chapman  
beliefs beliefs to Ischindel", psychology beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs  
88-918-88 (1881) psychology

-it to all and no one " psychology beliefs beliefs  
beliefs beliefs to Ischindel" psychology beliefs beliefs  
88-918-88 (1881) psychology

88 to psychology beliefs beliefs" M. H. Morgan  
(1881) psychology beliefs to Ischindel", psychology  
18-88-88

" psychology beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs" R. G. Speer, E.  
101-88-88 (1881) Ischindel psychology

beliefs beliefs beliefs" L. C. and J. C. B. Smith, D. B. Smith, D.  
Ischindel", psychology beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs  
88-188-88 (1881) psychology

beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs beliefs" R. G. Morgan, C. E. Morgan, C.  
psychology beliefs to Ischindel", psychology beliefs  
88-88-88

beliefs beliefs beliefs" R. H. Chapman, R. H. Chapman, R.  
88-088-88 psychology beliefs beliefs to Ischindel", psychology beliefs  
-beliefs beliefs beliefs" R. H. Chapman, R. H. Chapman, R.  
88-188-88 (1881) psychology

Traxler, A. E. "Reliability, Constancy, and Validity of the Otis IQ," Journal of Applied Psychology, (1934), 18, 241-5

Tuckman, J. "Revised Minnesota Paper Form Board, Age and Grade Norms for High School Students," Occupations, (1947), 22, 97-100

### III. TEST MANUALS

Bennett, G. K. "Manual of Directions, Test of Mechanical Comprehension Form AA," Psychological Corporation, New York, 1941

Foust, J. W., and Schorling, R. "Manual of Directions for the Foust-Schorling Test of Functional Thinking in Mathematics," World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1944

Greene, H. A., and Piper, A. H. "Examiner's Manual for the Revised Edition of the Iowa Algebra Aptitude Test," Bureau of Education Research and Service, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, 1942

Lawshe, C. H., and Moutoux, A. C. "Preliminary Manual for the Purdue Industrial Training Classification Test," Science Research Associates, Chicago, 1942

Likert, R., and Quasha, W. H. "Manual of Directions for the Revised Minnesota Paper Form Board Test," Psychological Corporation, New York, 1941

Otis, A. S. "Manual of Directions for Gamma Tests, Forms Am and Bm of Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests," World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1937

. "Directions for Otis Arithmetic Reasoning Test," World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York, 1918

the Science Research Associates.

7. Otis Arithmetic Reasoning Test, Form A (Test  
B of Otis Group Intelligence Scale, Advanced Examina-

3

Texter, A. A., "Conceptions and  
Society to 1930 and the Visible  
Future", 1934, 84-2

"Minerals Better from Being  
Used Good for High Quality  
Decorations", 1947, 84-100

### III. MANUFACTURE

"Minerals to Learn", A. O. Janner  
and Associates, 1941, 84-1

"Lessons", A. W. Moore, 1941, 84-1  
"Lessons to the Young-Scholar", 1941, 84-1  
"Young Book Company", 1941, 84-1

"Lessons in Mineralogy", H. A. Teller, A. H. Gossen  
and Associates, 1941, 84-1  
"Lessons in Mineralogy", 1941, 84-1

"Lessons in Mineralogy", C. A. H. Gossen  
and Associates, 1941, 84-1  
"Lessons in Mineralogy", 1941, 84-1

"Lessons in Mineralogy", H. W. Moore, 1941, 84-1  
"Lessons in Mineralogy", 1941, 84-1

"Lessons in Mineralogy", S. A. Miller  
and Associates, 1941, 84-1  
"Lessons in Mineralogy", 1941, 84-1

"Lessons in Mineralogy", H. W. Moore, 1941, 84-1  
"Lessons in Mineralogy", 1941, 84-1

## APPENDIX B the World Book

## TESTS ADMINISTERED

8. Arithmetic Test, Thurstone Vocational Guide

1. Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Test, Gamma Form, by Arthur S. Otis, published by the World Book Company.
2. Revised Minnesota Paper Form Board, Series Ma, by R. Likert and W. H. Quasha, published by the Psychological Corporation.
3. Bennett Test of Mechanical Comprehension, Form AA, by George K. Bennett, published by the Psychological Corporation.
4. Foust-Schorling Test of Functional Thinking in Mathematics, Form A, by J. W. Foust and R. Schorling, published by the World Book Company.
5. Iowa Algebra Aptitude Test, Revised Edition, by H. A. Greene and A. H. Piper, published by the Bureau of Educational Research and Service State University of Iowa.
6. Purdue Industrial Training Classification Test, Form A, by C. H. Lawshe and A. C. Moutoux, published by the Science Research Associates.
7. Otis Arithmetic Reasoning Test, Form A (Test 5 of Otis Group Intelligence Scale, Advanced Examination)



tion) by A. S. Otis, published by the World Book Company.

8. Arithmetic Test, Thurstone Vocational Guidance Tests, by L. L. Thurstone, published by the World Book Company.

Electrical  
 Mechanical Drawing  
 Applied Physics  
 Electricity  
 Mathematics  
 Welding  
 Foundry  
 Patternmaking  
 Machine Shop  
 English

Mechanical Construction

Mathematics  
 Mechanical Drawing  
 Applied Physics  
 Electricity  
 Motor Laboratory  
 Welding  
 Patternmaking  
 Electrical wiring  
 Machine Shop  
 Foundry  
 English

Steam and Diesel Engineering

Mathematics  
 Mechanical Drawing  
 Applied Physics  
 Electricity  
 Motor Laboratory  
 Welding  
 Patternmaking  
 Machine Shop  
 Foundry  
 Welding  
 English

tion) by A. S. Ochs, published by the World Book  
Company.

Volume 1, 1911-1912, International Year, International Association of  
Book Collectors, published by the World  
Book Company.

## APPENDIX C

## COURSES OFFERED AT WXYZ TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

## TECHNICAL COURSES

	<u>First Term</u>	<u>Second Term</u>	<u>Unit Weights</u>
<u>Machine Construction and Tool Design</u>			
Mathematics	x	x	3
Mechanical Drawing	x	x	2
Applied Physics	x	x	4
Motor Laboratory	x	x	2
Electricity	x	x	4
Welding	x	x	1
Foundry	x	x	1
Patternmaking	x		1
Machine Work		x	1
English	x	x	2
<u>Electrical Construction</u>			
Mathematics	x	x	3
Mechanical Drawing	x	x	2
Applied Physics	x	x	4
Electricity	x	x	4
Motor Laboratory	x	x	2
Welding	x		1
Patternmaking	x		1
Electric-wiring		x	1
Machine Work	x	x	1
Foundry		x	1
English	x	x	2
<u>Steam and Diesel Engineering</u>			
Mathematics	x	x	3
Mechanical Drawing	x	x	2
Applied Physics	x	x	4
Electricity	x	x	4
Motor Laboratory	x	x	2
Patternmaking	x	x	1
Machine Work	x		1
Foundry	x	x	1
Welding	x	x	1
English	x	x	2



	<u>First Term</u>	<u>Second Term</u>	<u>Unit Weights</u>
<u>Architectural Construction</u>			
Mathematics	x	x	3
Architectural Drawing	x	x	4
Applied Physics	x	x	4
Building Methods	x	x	2
Carpentry	x	x	1
Building Materials	x	x	2
Laboratory	x	x	2
English	x	x	2
<u>Aircraft Maintenance Engineering</u>			
Mathematics	x	x	3
Mechanical Drawing	x	x	2
Applied Physics	x	x	4
Electricity	x	x	4
Welding	x	x	2
Aircraft Shop Technique	x	x	2
Machine Work	x	x	2
Pattern Shop	x	x	1
Civil Aeronautics Rules	x	x	3
<u>Industrial Electronics</u>			
Mathematics	x	x	3
Mechanical Drawing	x	x	2
Applied Physics	x	x	4
Electricity	x	x	4
Motor Laboratory	x	x	3
Radio Shop Technique	x	x	1
Electronics	x	x	5

#### INTENSIVE SHOP COURSES

<u>Pattern-Making and Machine Design</u>			
Mathematics	x	x	3
Mechanical Drawing	x	x	3
Applied Physics	x	x	5
Pattern-Making	x	x	6



	APPLIED TERM	First TERM	Second TERM	Unit Weights
Machine-Work and Tool Making				
Mathematics		x	x	3
Mechanical Drawing		x	x	3
Applied Physics	consists of a unit value for each subject,	x	x	5
Machine Work		x	x	66
Building Construction				
Mathematics		x	x	3
Architectural Drawing	requirement	x	x	3
Applied Physics		x	x	5
Carpentry	values for each subject are given in	x	x	4
Building Materials				
Laboratory	see course (see Appendix C)	x	x	3

The weight given to each grade is as follows:

The courses listed above include only the first year subjects as the second year was not a part of this study. The credit earned in each subject is determined by multiplying the unit value of the subject by the weight of the grade received for that subject.

The grade "index" equals the sum of the credits earned divided by the sum of the unit values.

Honor rating is given students whose index is 3.50 or above. Promotion requires an index of 1.50 or better. The final index for the second half-year, either first or second year, must not be below 1.50.

Graduation requires not only a passing index, but each student must also satisfy the faculty with regard

Machine	Machine-Work and Tool	Third Term	Second Term	First Term	Workshop	Final Unit
28	Machine-welding	x	x			
29	Mechanized Drawing	x	x			
30	Abbildungsbasis	x	x			
31	Mechanized Work	x	x			
	<u>Building Construction</u>					
32	Machine-welding	x	x			
33	Machine-secondary Drawing	x	x			
34	Abbildungsbasis	x	x			
35	Carburetor	x	x			
36	Building Materials	x	x			
37	Reportorial	x	x			

the course till date only the first year completed as the second year was not a part of my  
studies

to his attendance and APPENDIX D  
DETAILS OF THE MARKING SYSTEM  
AT WXYZ TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

The plan consists of a unit value for each subject, a weight for each grade, the credit earned in each subject, a half-yearly "index", honor grades, passing grades, and minimum requirements.

Unit values for each subject are given in the tables for each course (see Appendix C).

The weight given to each grade is as follows:

A equals 4, B+ equals 3.5, B equals 3, C+ equals 2.5, C equals 2, P equals 1, and D equals zero.

Credit earned in each subject is determined by multiplying the unit value of the subject by the weight of the grade received for that subject.

The grade "index" equals the sum of the credits earned divided by the sum of the unit values.

Honor rating is given students whose index is 3.50 or above. Promotion requires an index of 1.50 or better. The final index for the second half-year, either first or second year, must not be below 1.50.

Graduation requires not only a passing index, but each student must also satisfy the faculty with regard



to his attendance and character, and he must have shown a sincere desire to attend all classes and to meet all requirements of every subject in his course.

EFFICIENCY BOUND  
REG. U. S. PAT. OFF.  
A. P. & P. CO.



BOSTON UNIVERSITY



1 1719 02555 6764

**ACCOPRESS BINDER**

**BF 250-P7-EMB**

Made By

**ACCO PRODUCTS, INC.**

Ogdensburg, N. Y., U.S.A.

